

HOUSING

Vol. 21

JUNE, 1932

No. 2

A PLAGUE O' BOTH YOUR HOUSES

THE ENGLISH TOWN PLANNING BILL

Politics not only makes strange bed-fellows but also brings strange turns of Fortune's wheel.

This has been notably demonstrated recently in England by the fate that has befallen the English Town Planning Bill—greatly desired by English town planners and rightly hailed by them as essential to the future development of their country, the carrying out of slum clearance on any intelligent or comprehensive plan, the preservation of the amenities of the countryside, the fulfilment of rural development and the utilization of zoning as a factor in future city development.

If any one had predicted a few months ago that the Town Planning Bill would come to be regarded in many quarters with as much aversion as had been the notorious land tax schemes of Lloyd George before the War, the statement would have been received with incredulity. But this is what has happened.

A year ago when the Labor Government was in power a carefully prepared highly technical rather voluminous complicated bill dealing with Town Planning and intended to supersede all existing laws was introduced in Parliament. It was received at that time with very little interest and certainly with very little opposition and went jogging blithely along the accustomed parliamentary path, having its second reading at an early date and then went to Committee where its details were threshed out in a long series of discussions which led to a number of minor amendments and the general perfecting of the Bill. This process was not completed when Parliament adjourned for the Summer recess, and changes in the political complexion of that body when Parliament reassembled in the Fall led to the Bill's untimely death.

When the new National Government came into power this Winter, it was natural that they should consider most carefully the reintroduc-

tion of this measure. That the Bill would have the support of the new Government was almost a foregone conclusion, for its principal proposals had been strongly advocated some years ago by Neville Chamberlain, the new Chancellor of the Exchequer and one of the important leaders in the new Government and in the Conservative Party which was returned to office with an overwhelming majority in the new Parliament. It was also very strongly supported by the new Minister of Health, Sir Hilton Young, who had previously sponsored a Bill dealing with the preservation of the rural countryside, the provisions of which were embodied in the Town Planning Bill.

It is not strange, therefore, when Parliament reassembled early in February that the Minister of Health, Sir Hilton Young, should move the second reading of the Town and Country Planning Bill which had been recently reintroduced in Parliament.

The statement made by the Minister of Health at that time and place gives accurately and fairly the Government's point of view with regard to this measure and also reflects the manner in which the people of England regarded it at that time.

"A NON-CONTENTIOUS MEASURE"

The Minister of Health in moving the second reading of this Bill stated that the measure to a large extent was non-contentious, was wholly non-partisan and had been prepared and introduced by his predecessor in office in the Labor Government and had met with general support from the whole House at that time, that it had gone to Committee and was there threshed out in a long series of discussions, which led to the composition of different points of view, and very largely to the improvement of the Bill. He went on to point out that all the great representative bodies of the local governments had approved resolutions calling for legislation of this character, and that no fewer than 18 private Acts had been passed conferring on particular local authorities powers similar to those which were being made general in the Bill; that it had been thought wise to substitute for these piecemeal private local Acts a public statute enacted by the House dealing with this subject.

He explained that the Bill was a planning bill to give local authorities the power to exercise reasonable foresight and control in planning the development of their localities; that it was not a bill to confer arbitrary powers on a distant centralized office but to put into the hands of the localities themselves the power of controlling their own destinies in these important matters; that it was not a bill of compulsion but of

permission; that it was simply to put power people wanted into their hands to use—as and when they wanted it.

He added that the overcrowding of the towns made planning and reorganization necessary to obtain more room for people; that when urban areas began to expand at the beginning of the last century things unfortunately were done without foresight, and that as they looked at some of the older regions they realized the tragedy of industrial civilization having been allowed to grow up in such a haphazard way.

Summarizing the contents of the Bill, the Minister of Health stated that the Bill would not impose restrictions on private enterprise, but on the contrary was intended to obtain the greatest measure of liberty and facility for private enterprise in development by means of adjustment in relation to surroundings and neighborhood. That the Bill would enhance the amenities of life in the country by regulating, for instance, the number of houses to be put up and the space that should be between them. The measure would enable local authorities to extend planning schemes to undeveloped land and to land already built upon. Another very important provision of the Bill, as he pointed out, was that it gave power to local authorities to plan ahead for public improvements.

One of the great changes which the Bill made was the extension of the power to make plans for towns to the control of the countryside—for the first time in England—pointing out that the Bill would enable local authorities to deal with “ribbon” development by zones and restrictions, and by the auxiliary power to buy strips of land alongside of main thoroughfares and the control of the number of side streets to be allowed from a main street.

The Bill would provide for compensation to owners who were injuriously affected by any action taken under it, and on the other hand where an actual betterment of values resulted from the provisions of the Bill, there would be an assessment for benefit; and, finally, the Bill would give local authorities power to protect ancient buildings and buildings of artistic character.

Following this statement, although a certain amount of opposition developed, the Bill was read a second time without a division and was sent to a Standing Committee following the usual parliamentary practice. And then the trouble began.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

No better summary could be made of the Bill's provisions* than was made by *The Architects' Journal* a year ago with regard to the

* See “*Housing*”, October, 1931, pp. 243-246.

Bill of the then Labor Government. It summarized its 10 principal provisions as follows:

It enables planning schemes to be made for areas already built over and also for rural areas. It enables regional schemes to be made for regional matters, and supplementary schemes for local matters. It also aims at checking sporadic development, and in several different ways will tend to prevent "ribbon" development. It retains the old principle of liability to pay compensation, but wisely excepts from compensation cases where undesirable development must be prohibited. It increases betterment from 50% to 100%. It enables special charges to be levied on property of which the value is increased by public improvement. Local authorities under it may acquire land compulsorily if necessary, so as to direct general development. The existing procedure is accelerated. In order to meet any complaint of excessive bureaucratic control, the validity of any scheme, or of any of its provisions, may be tested in the courts.

A STORM OF OPPOSITION

When the Bill got to Committee the storm broke. How little the sponsors of this measure expected the opposition that subsequently developed is evidenced from the fact that the *Journal of the Town Planning Institute* as recently as its issue of February said editorially with regard to it, "There has been almost a lack of opposition from any quarter." This tranquil atmosphere was, however, soon disturbed and the sponsors of the measure rudely jolted out of their confident belief that all was well with the measure.

An organized opposition on behalf of the property interests of the country soon manifested itself, members of the new Parliament vying with each other in presenting to the Committee serious objections to the Bill as it would work in practice. Led by the Marquis of Hartington, the son of the Duke of Devonshire, the possessor of vast holdings of land throughout England, opposition has been raised to nearly every important feature of the measure.

The hearings in committee which began early in February continued until recently. It took the Committee six meetings to get as far as Clause 7 in their consideration of the 53 clauses of the Bill. The Bill has already been seriously damaged in committee by the amendment made to Clause 6 limiting the power to extend town planning control to rural and built-upon land. As the Government has acquiesced and has accepted this amendment, it hardly seems likely that when the Bill comes from committee, the action taken by the Committee will be repudiated by the House. Such things do not happen to government measures where the Government has a working majority of 500 members.

ZONING MADE IMPOSSIBLE

The amendment that has been accepted to Clause 6 would seem to obstruct the principal purpose that the Bill has in view. Instead of

allowing the local authorities to zone any built-up area and make town planning schemes covering any lands rural or urban as the original Bill contemplated, the Bill as amended limits these powers solely to those cases where the Minister of Health—an officer of the central government—approves the proposals of the local authorities, which he may not do unless he is satisfied that public improvements are likely to be made.

A further change consented to by the Government would greatly diminish the value of the Bill so far as the application of zoning is concerned. Under this amendment if it is shown that an owner has suffered through having his existing building declared to be suitable only for a certain use, he will be entitled to full compensation. Obviously, zoning as it is known in other countries is quite impossible under such conditions.

Among other principal objections that have been raised not only by property owners but by apparently disinterested members of Parliament who have begun to study the Bill and consider it in its practical application, may be cited the following:

That which permits the establishment of building lines without compensation; the “sterilization” of considerable portions of property that cannot be built upon at all; the control of elevations, by which is meant the passing upon the aesthetic appearance of buildings and the prevention of their erection if they do not conform to standards of taste set up by the local authorities; the denial of access to the courts for a review of decisions made by the local authorities; the relegation of such decisions to Government Departments; the provisions for “compensation” and “betterment”.

These are but a few points at issue.

SELFISH INTERESTS VS. INTELLIGENT PLANNING

Contemplating these attacks on well recognized and fundamental principles of town planning and powers many of which have been in existence for many years in England, it is not strange that the town planners of that country should regard the present attack on this measure as representing a reactionary, individualistic attitude on the part of selfish interests that have little regard for the welfare of the country, but are concerned primarily with protecting their own property rights and securing for themselves an increment in values from the

enhancement of their property and from neighboring property, which they naturally desire to possess.

On the one hand there is what may be termed the property owners' group of "practical" men, viewing this subject from the point of view of their own interests. On the other, a technical group of city planners, architects and housing reformers who view the subject from their longer and more intensive experience with the problems involved and who naturally see the question more from the point of view of the public interests than the interests of private individuals. This group of so-called "experts"—the town planners and the architects—are convinced that everything in the Bill is sound and that it should be enacted into law as it stands. The group of "practical" men regard these "experts" more or less as theorists and doctrinaires. In fact, some of them, approaching this subject for the first time, are horrified at what seem to them radical and unheard of proposals.

PARLIAMENT'S REAL ATTITUDE

The real truth of the situation lies between these two extremes. Lieutenant Colonel F. E. Fremantle, a member of Parliament, one of England's leading housing experts and a veteran in the cause of housing reform, at a meeting called by the National Housing and Town Planning Council in March to protest against the weakening and destructive amendments that were being proposed to the Bill in Committee, set the housing reformers and town planners right in pointing out to them what the essence of the parliamentary situation was.

Speaking from a long parliamentary experience, Colonel Fremantle rightly indicated why the members of Parliament were seeking the changes in the measure that had been made manifest before the Committee. He said:

If I may say so, the point on which I quarrel with my friend Mr. Elgood is this: He remarked that "this comes from a body of amateurs tinkering with a subject they do not understand." Sir, that is what Parliament does; that is what Parliament is elected to do. Parliament is not elected as a body of experts. Heaven forbid that it ever should be! It occasionally has people who are, to a certain extent, experts. I am occasionally damned as an expert myself. And the reason why we are definitely and etymologically damned as experts is because the proper position of a Member of Parliament is a judicial position when it comes to any decision as to what is to be done; he makes his own contribution as a private individual, and it is because of such contribution, among other things, that he is elected to Parliament. At the same time, when he comes down to the constructive work of Parliament, what he has got to do is to decide between the experts.

So we have this position, that when you have a Standing Committee that represents by a procedure of the House, the whole House, definitely chosen to represent proportionately the different sections and feelings of the House, it includes people who have strong feelings on the particular subject as vented on the second reading of a measure, and it includes people who have no feelings at all in the matter, but who usually take what is called the common-sense line in the House. That being the case, the difficulty is not to justify the movement, or the particular proceedings of a measure as we see them, but to explain them to the Members of Parliament generally, and especially to the Members of the Standing Committee.

That is the real problem we are up against, and in order to do that we have to understand their mentality. Their composition is the reflection of the General Election of last year, as a result of which we have something like 200 to 250 new members of the House of Commons, and a very large number of men who are thirsting to take some part in this reconstruction of England do not know what to do. Once they have taken their seat in the House of Commons and have made their maiden speech, there seems to be no further use for them except in the Division Lobby. Therefore, that matter has been definitely taken up by the Whips, and they are turned on to do some work or other, and there is a flood of Committee work to do and they learn their work in Committee. But when they come to Standing Committee they are open to expressions of feeling.

THE STIGMA OF "SOCIALISTIC LEGISLATION"

The worst day's work ever done for this measure was the day on which, in his glowing enthusiasm, the Right Honorable Herbert Morrison, the late Minister of Transport, said to an audience that this was the finest bit of Socialistic legislation that had ever been brought before the House of Commons. You and I may agree, or disagree, with that expression of opinion by Mr. Morrison. Probably, when we get down to it in our smoking rooms, we will agree that that depends on what you mean by Socialism; but the very fact that he said that and that it was reproduced again and again was the thing that struck a very large number of Members who were returned to Parliament. That is what we have got to face.

We are not ashamed of saying that this is one of the finest pieces of social reform that you could have. This is one of the best expressions of the use of the social resources of the community for the sake of the community and in justice to everybody concerned. But what we have got to impress upon these people is that this kind of legislation—which includes a certain amount, not simply of town planning and housing legislation, but also of social reform legislation—is in line with such acts as the Factory Acts and with Disraeli's own pronouncements on the subject of social reform.

I think we have to justify our position and state that we stand for all measures of social reform such as the Town and Country Planning Bill as being an essential part of our political faith, and we have to see it carried through against the wreckers, to whichever side they belong.

JUSTICE TO THE PROPERTY OWNER

That is the difficulty we are up against. What does that mean? That means that you have got to have absolute justice to those who hold and have property under the law of the land, and it is that difficulty, that fear, that meets everyone who has not been face to face with the proper solution of it. Every owner of property knows that people do come forward on Local Authorities, or write to the Press and arouse public opinion, when they want to get something for the public good regardless of private rights. That is one of the things that is behind the opposition to this measure, the feeling, founded on definite instances, where good landowners have been mulcted, or, to take another more common experience, have been expected to give up this, that or the other thing, regardless of compensation. That accounts for one of the great difficulties that is looming ahead of us in the Betterment Clause.

It has been my endeavor during the stages of this Committee to bring back those who are opposing the Bill—not from any malice but simply from failure to understand the vastness of the subject—to what, after all, are our common objects, viz., the preservation of rural England, and also efficiency and economy in our planning work. If they really are agreed on those two issues you can bring home to them the appalling waste that we have suffered through centuries, and are continuing to suffer every day, through the lack of planning our built-up areas, and through the deplorable destruction of the countryside.

I earnestly hope that in one way or other we shall get through this difficult period which still lies ahead of us and that we shall be able to see at no distant date this extension of town and country planning to which we have all been looking forward.

Opposed to the views of these more or less private interests—perhaps one might fairly call them selfish interests—we find arrayed in support of the measure both by formal resolution and in other ways, a Conference called by the National Housing and Town Planning Council, and representing 18 Regional Committees, 5 County Councils, 24 Borough Councils and 81 District Councils, the Manchester and District Joint Town Planning Advisory Committees, the Royal Institute of British Architects, the Council for the Preservation of Rural England, the National Housing and Town Planning Council, the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, the British Town Planning Institute and many others.

STARTLING AND RADICAL PROPOSALS

When one considers the novel questions that are proposed in this measure, such as the control by the local authorities of the architectural style of the exterior of all buildings erected in future, and reflects how few of these 1800 local authorities throughout England and Wales are really constituted to pass upon such question, are fit to establish standards of taste, it is not strange that there should be a considerable

group who view the measure as a wholesale extension of bureaucratic powers, the infliction of injustice and the denial of the rights of British citizens.

This is further realized when it is pointed out, as it was by Lord Hartington in discussing the measure in Committee, that owners of property hold the belief that under the Bill they may be prevented from making any use of their property for from 1 to 10 years, and during the whole of that time be without compensation; that by means of this measure local authorities wishing to buy property from an owner may be able to so depreciate its value as to get it at their own price and not at the price that the owner of it thinks a fair one; that the local authorities can keep away all other purchasers, delay indefinitely the moment when compensation is to become payable, and compel the owner to incur much trouble and expense in seeking to develop land which it is desirable in the public interest should be developed.

THE CONTROL OF ALL USE OF LAND

It requires no more than the mere statement that the Bill contemplates control by the authorities of the use of all land throughout England and Wales to make one realize how radical and far reaching the measure is.

This is brought home to one in very definite fashion in an article "On the Land, the Law and the Tax" in a recent issue of *Garden Cities and Town Planning* by the editor of that journal, William L. Hare. In this article Mr. Hare discusses the three kinds of land tenure that are to be found in England and contrasts the attitude towards the control of land in the new Town Planning Bill and in the so-called Land Tax Bill enacted under the late Labor Government.

Discussing the technical problems involved in the new Town Planning Bill in its control of land, Mr. Hare asks a number of very pertinent questions and points out the problems that will confront the nation when the Bill is enacted into law. He says in part:

Land in this island is a fixed quantity and we are sufficiently crowded at any rate in parts of it. The Bill asks us as one great democracy containing 2,196 smaller democracies within its body to determine for ourselves on general principles and by common methods to what uses units of land shall best be put. Such a problem to be solved, requires the highest degree of patience and technical wisdom. It needs long-distance foresight into the future conditions which at present may only be seen dimly, and the decisions made from time to time by local authorities will be—as the Bill prescribes—watched and controlled to a considerable extent by the central authority.

What is the best use of the land? means that we want answers to a series of such questions as follow: Where must our basic heavy industries be conducted in view of the deposits of minerals? To what convenient spots can some of our lighter industries be distributed? What land is most suited to agriculture and how much of it can be found conveniently near to the great consuming centres? What shall be the character of the new road system and how shall it be made to co-ordinate with the existing railway system? How much land should be given to the new function of aerial transport? And, finally, how much land in how many units large and small shall be given up to the essential service of health and delight?

The dwellings of the people have always necessarily had to be adjusted to their workplaces; and for all persons the problem of the relation between home and factory, shop or school is now being recognized as pressing and important. Therefore, Housing, Industry and Transport constitute one system; and if industry is to be distributed even to some small extent, Housing must follow with it and lie around it. Therefore, the formal question presents itself; Where shall the people live and how much land shall be allocated for their dwellings?

We think Colonel Fremantle is right in pointing out that much has to be done to educate public opinion with regard to the measure, and that it was in advance of its time.

OTHER RADICAL PROPOSALS

When it is considered that heretofore in England there has never been control of the *use* of buildings, that the whole idea of Zoning, as we know it in the United States and as they know it in many European countries, as applied to existing uses of buildings is entirely novel to the average property owner of Great Britain and to the average citizen of the British Isles, it is not strange that this should seem to be a very great departure from existing practice and that Parliament should hesitate to confer such powers upon the local authorities.

We have already pointed out the rather startling proposal of giving to the local authorities the determination of questions of taste, the power to say whether a building may be erected or not because it does or does not conform to certain artistic standards of appearance. In America any such attempt would certainly be fraught with great opposition. Irrespective of any constitutional questions that might be involved in the application of this principle in that country, the proposal would in itself meet with universal opposition in the United States.

The proposal to "sterilize" large areas of land, to keep them out of use, to prevent them being built upon at all for years, without compensation to the owner until the land is ultimately taken, would be quite impossible of adoption in the United States. It is not strange that

owners of property whose land may be "sterilized" in this fashion should object.

It is an extremely radical proposal that owners of land that may be benefited by the withholding of other land from building shall compensate the owners whose land is thus withheld, that those who benefit by a public improvement shall help to carry the burden of that public improvement to an unusual degree.

The Bill attempted to do too much. It was too long. It was too involved in expression. It was too complicated. No matter to what extent it continued existing law—and to a very large extent it did continue provisions of existing law—the impression that it must have made upon the minds of a new Parliament could not help but be unfortunate.

What the outcome of the present situation is likely to be, we do not know. At the time this article is written the Bill has gone through this process of constructive and destructive criticism in Committee, and will soon come back to the House for the Third Reading and Report stages.

Whether the Government will finally decide to abandon the measure or proceed with it with the crippling amendments that have been made, in the face of the opposition that has been aroused is not disclosed at this time.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE

One thing is certain. The people of England as a whole are not concerned about the technical aspects of this measure. But they are very much concerned with the preservation of the country side and the right development of England.

They want the enactment of a measure that will bring about the control of all land whether built-upon or unbuilt-upon; the establishment of zoning upon the same practical and successful lines that it has been established in the United States and in other countries; the prevention of "ribbon" development; the preservation of the countryside; the preservation and protection of buildings of historic and artistic value.

The Government would be well advised to enact such a measure into law.

THE SITUATION IN ENGLAND

One of the disadvantages of government housing and government-aided housing, which American advocates of this method of dealing with a great problem generally lose sight of, is the fact that when

there are changes in the government in a country committed to that policy, there are likely to be serious interruptions of a consistent programme for the betterment of housing conditions—a handicap not to be found in those countries where the providing of housing accommodations is left to private enterprise.

England at the present time affords a splendid object lesson of the limitations to housing advance through governmental action. A year ago with the Labor Government in the saddle in that country a vast programme of housing improvement was announced and was contemplated. An ambitious scheme for slum clearance on a wholesale basis was elaborated and an act of Parliament passed making it possible to carry out this plan. Government subsidies to stimulate the building of houses for various classes in the community were continued and in some cases increased. New forms of government aid were developed, such as a subsidy to slum dwellers for the number of children in their family, a scheme of Differential Rents, and others.

Then before any part of this ambitious programme could be really carried into effect, the Government fell. A new Government came into power. In this case what amounted almost to a peaceful political revolution took place.

Instead of a Parliament in which the balance of power was held by a minority party through its alliance with another minority party, as a result of a general election a single party completely dominates the legislative assembly of the nation.

At the election held last Fall the people of England returned the Conservative Party to power by an overwhelming majority. Although a so-called National Government holds sway with a Cabinet in which representatives of other parties are to be found, the Conservative Party completely dominates the Government and holds control of Parliament by the unprecedented majority of 500.

With such a change in the political complexion of an entire nation and at the same time with the advent of a financial and economic crisis, and the realization on the part of the people as a whole that that crisis was due very largely to the ill considered voting of public funds for social enterprises, housing among others, it would not be strange if there were a radical revision of England's housing policy.

BUILDING FOR THE LOWER-PAID WORKERS

The new policy may be summed up as concentrating government aid on smaller houses for renting to the lower paid workers. This change was foreshadowed shortly after the new Government came into

power last Fall. In responding to certain proposals made to him by the Housing Committee of the Manchester Corporation, the new Minister of Health, Sir Hilton Young, announced that the Ministry had decided to prohibit in future the building by local authorities with government aid of all but the smallest type, or "A-3" house, viz., the non-parlor house with the bathroom down stairs—a house of about 760 square feet in area.

A few weeks later the Minister of Health made an official announcement of the Government's policy with regard to the granting of subsidies for housing in the future.

THE GOVERNMENT'S NEW POLICY

In a circular to the local authorities of England and Wales under date of January 12th issued after consultation on his part with the Associations representing all the local authorities principally concerned in the housing of the working classes, the new policy was announced as follows:

The critical period through which the country is now passing and the present financial circumstances make it imperative that all new expenditure on housing should be used to the greatest possible advantage.

It is generally admitted that the outstanding need at the present time is for the building of houses which can be let at rents within the means of the poorer members of the working classes. The Departmental Committee on the Rent Restriction Acts, whose terms of reference led necessarily to a general review of housing conditions, show clearly in their report that, in spite of the immense volume and cost of house building since the war, the needs of the poorer workers are not in fact being adequately met. The evidence available in the reports of medical officers of health and of the Minister's officers leads to the same conclusion.

SMALLER HOUSES

The Minister has therefore suggested to the Associations whom he has consulted that local authorities should concentrate their efforts on the provision of a type of house which can be built at a low cost and can be let at a rent within the means of the more poorly paid workers. The type of house which he has in mind is the three-bedroomed non-parlor house of about 760 square feet, which experience has shown gives adequate accommodation for the ordinary family with children. Houses of this type can, with due regard to economy in lay-out of land and construction of roads and sewers, be built in most parts of the country at an inclusive cost which will allow the rents to be fixed at 10s. a week, inclusive of rates, or less.

The Minister does not suggest that a hard and fast rule should be laid down excluding from subsidy all houses of a larger size. He recognizes that there may be a special need in certain areas for larger

houses to accommodate very large families, but he is of opinion that the provision of these houses should be quite exceptional. It is hoped that the concentration by local authorities on the provision of the small house will widen the field in which private enterprise can operate and that private enterprise will be induced, without subsidy, to provide houses of other types both for sale and for letting, in substantial numbers.

The Minister is glad to be able to state that the Associations have concurred in his suggestions and have expressed their desire to work in the closest co-operation with him in the matter. He asks all local authorities to limit their new building proposals in accordance with the suggestions which he has made, and he thinks that it would be an advantage if they would submit their proposals in a preliminary form, with a statement of the facts on which their estimate of need is based, before adopting definite plans and specifications.

When this change in government policy was foreshadowed by the Minister of Health in his conference with the representatives of the city of Manchester it aroused great concern among the local authorities throughout England and among housing reformers in that country.

MANCHESTER OBJECTS

Alderman Miles E. Mitchell, the Chairman of the Housing Committee of Manchester, made the statement at the time that this decision would have the effect of bringing their work in Manchester to a complete stand still, that the whole of the great Wythenshawe* Estate and other estates under development at that time on which there were about 300 men employed would have to be redesigned and replanned. Assuming that the proposal was a reasonable one, it would mean that the whole matter would have to be referred back to the Council and their consent obtained to this change in the type of house that it had been planned to develop on these estates, thus necessitating a considerable delay before a single house could be erected. This would have the effect of keeping out of employment between 2,000 and 3,000 workers. Whereas if this change were not required, this considerable army of working men could be set to work in the very near future.

Alderman Mitchell pointed out at the time that something like 62% of all applications for lettings received by the local authorities in his city were for the types of houses of the larger kind which the Ministry now proposed to prohibit as eligible for the government subsidy. He added that although under the existing regulations it was left to the discretion of the local authority to determine the proportion of different types of houses that should be built in accordance with the

* See page 145.

needs of the district, the decision of the Government would, naturally, be controlling; for they held the whip hand in holding the purse. To him this change in policy on the part of the Government meant that working men in future would not have a house with a parlor, nor even a house without a parlor but with three bedrooms of a sufficient size to meet the needs of their families—much less a house with four bedrooms, a type which had been built to meet the needs of the larger families.

In conclusion Alderman Mitchell called attention to the fact that the new policy would represent no material gain to the tax payers of England as there would be no financial gain to the Exchequer (Treasury) as a result of the proposed order, as the government subsidy was payable on account of every house built, irrespective of its size.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE RE-ENTERS THE FIELD

While no statement was issued by the Minister of Health as to the reasons that had led him to reach his decision other than the statements made in the Circular to local authorities, it is not without significance that the change in government policy announced to the Manchester delegation followed closely after representations made to the Minister of Health by the National Federation of Building Trades Employers, who had stated to the Government that it was the unanimous view of its 9 Regions or branches throughout England that conditions had now so developed that, without detriment to the future provision of necessary dwellings for the housing of the people of England, the granting of subsidies to the building of working-class houses could cease, except insofar as such subsidies were necessary in connection with slum clearance and rural housing, as embodied in the Slum Clearance Act of 1930 and the Rural Housing Act of 1931.

They pointed out at that time and reinforced their suggestions by facts and arguments that if the Government and the local authorities would limit the use of the subsidy exclusively to these purposes, private enterprise would be quite able to provide the whole of the dwellings required to house the rest of the people, and that it would do so more expeditiously, satisfactorily and economically than under any system of government intervention by subsidy or otherwise.

In making these suggestions to the Government the operative builders of England renewed a recommendation and a declaration of policy that they had made to the Labor Government a year previous. Speaking through the secretary of the National Federation of House Builders, a central organization representative of the private house

builders of England, they expressed the view at that time that its members were convinced that it was impossible for private enterprise to build houses to rent to tenants without financial assistance by means of subsidies and loans on mortgage but that if the facilities which they went on to suggest were afforded to the members of the house building industry, the housing of the very poor could and would be provided very rapidly by private enterprise and that the activities of the local authorities could then be curtailed strictly within the limits of re-housing slum dwellers and providing living accommodations for those of the lower-paid working classes whom they thought might be described as the very poor.

RENT RESTRICTION FATAL TO HOUSING PROGRESS

In explanation of the scheme which they proposed they had the following to say:

Subsidy schemes are still necessary because of the continued restriction of the rents of pre-war houses under the Rent Restriction Acts, and no real normal position can be attained until all restrictions are withdrawn and housing once again is a free and unfettered industry. The withdrawal of the restrictions might cause a very temporary inconvenience in some cases, but the adjustment of all rents to an economic basis would bring housing into its old position and would prove the most rapid and economical and efficient method of solving the housing problem of the country.

It is evident to the house builder that it is a practical proposition to build houses which are required by the working classes, given assistance which will not be greater than that now afforded to the local authorities; and if the recommendations of this Report are adopted it can be confidently asserted that houses will once again be provided by private enterprise and provided in adequate numbers, so that the expensive and unsuitable schemes of the local authorities may be discontinued and the acute overcrowding of the working-class districts of our great cities may become a thing of the past.

In drawing up the scheme the Federation has had in mind the demand for small, comfortable houses containing two and three bedrooms, bath and all modern requirements, to be let at approximately 7s 6d to 9s 6d per week excluding rates (local taxes).

The scheme which they set forth involved changes in the subsidy, not in amount but in method of awarding it; the fixing of a maximum rent for the whole period of the subsidy; the permitting of a density of 20 houses to the gross acre; a provision for defraying part of the cost of the making of roads and other public improvements by the local authorities and not charging it all to the housing scheme; the permitting houses to be built in rows of 8 houses rather than in pairs; and, finally, that competition with them by the local authorities in this

field should be made impossible by having the Government refuse to grant subsidies to any local authority where a subsidy to private enterprise on these terms had been denied; and that where subsidies or loans to private enterprise had been refused by the local authority and it was proved that the houses were needed, the Government should make grants or loans direct to the builder.

Upon the announcement of this bold challenge made a year ago by the operative builders of England to the advocates of government-housing, a storm of opposition naturally arose among the advocates of the existing state of things.

The builders' proposals were hailed as a "counter-revolution", and particular objection was made by the friends of housing reform to the proposal to increase the number of houses to the acre and to permit a return to rows or groups of 8 houses in a row.

The Labor Government then in power naturally did not look with favor upon these proposals, as it was very definitely committed to the existing state of things and inclined to have the Government and the Local authorities do everything and private enterprise do as little as possible.

In the public discussion that followed these proposals of the National Federation of House Builders it was pointed out by their Secretary that the then policy of housing had resulted in an expense to the country of several hundreds of millions of pounds (approximately £400,000,000) for Council houses, while private enterprise at a cost to the public of about 1/10 of that amount had produced double the number of houses in the same period.

RESULTS UNDER SUBSIDY AND NO SUBSIDY

We have no doubt that the new Government was very much influenced in its determination by the fact that the number of houses built by private enterprise without state subsidy, had risen from 64,740 in 1929 to 138,728 in 1931, and at the same time the number of houses built by local authorities with both local and governmental subsidy had decreased from 55,723 in 1929 to 52,514 in 1931.

THE RISING COST TO THE TAXPAYER

In presenting these facts the National Federation of House Builders last September issued a manifesto on the subject to members of Parliament in which it pointed out that the discontinuance of the subsidy authorized by the Act of 1924 in the case of houses not completed by a certain date would relieve the country from a cost which

was growing at the rate of £100,000,000 a year; and that if competition from local authorities could be eliminated, the number of houses built by private enterprise would very considerably increase and there would be a very distinct revival in building houses for the workers.

After citing the figures just quoted showing the increase in the output of private enterprise without state subsidy and the decrease in the efforts of the local authorities since 1929, the builders' organization states that it is evident that private enterprise will very soon replace the shortage that a discontinuance of building activity by the local authorities would create, and that such a course would leave the local authorities free to devote their attention to slum clearance in which direction, they add, the real housing question exists.

They pointed out also that the amount of contributions from the Exchequer (Federal Treasury) in the form of subsidies to housing during the current year will be practically £12,000,000. This is in addition to contributions by the local authorities, amounting to about £2,500,000, thus making a total of £14,500,000 (\$72,500,000 at par) as the cost to the tax payers of Great Britain in a single year for subsidizing housing, adding that in 5 years the country will be saddled with a burden of over £20,000,000 a year (\$100,000,000 at par) in housing subsidies.

Finally, they suggested as a new Government policy

1. That the subsidy under the Act of 1924 should be withdrawn.
2. That so far as practicable the existing municipal houses should be let only to tenants of the lower-paid working classes.

THE GOVERNMENT REALIZES HOUSING NEEDS

That the Government is aware of the need of the continuance of further effort in the housing field was made plain by a statement made in Parliament by the Minister of Health a few months ago. Replying to the assertion that the local authorities had abandoned their housing programme to the extent of £33,000,000, the Minister of Health denying this stated

Nobody is going to pretend that at the present time the housing situation does not need measures of remedy and relief, but it is not turning one's eyes in the right direction to ask for greater interference by the Government. What the housing industry and housing accommodation are suffering from is not too little government interference but too much.

He indicated that one of the first inquiries that the new Government would undertake would be to inquire into the present activities

of the local authorities with regard to the housing situation, and stated that as a result of that inquiry he was confident that there would be more employment on assisted housing during the winter than there had been the year previous. He cautioned the public that there was no need at that time to stimulate the local authorities to additional activity, that there was a reasonable activity on their part and no actual sign of any wholesale or reckless abandonment of any reasonable programme of housing.

Speaking in Parliament very recently, Sir E. Hilton Young made the following statement with reference to housing:

He said that each house approved for subsidy at the present time incurred a liability of £130 to the Exchequer and a consequential liability of £65 to the local authority—a total of £195, equivalent to a charge of £7 10s. a year for 40 years. The annual recurring liability to the national Budget was no less than £12,750,000. The number of houses built since the War was about 1,820,000, and the increase of population had been about 1,000,000. The average number of persons per house was barely four.

That did not show that there was no longer a housing problem, because it was not an even distribution; but there was no evidence that the country as a whole was suffering from a housing shortage. It meant that in each proposition for fresh housing they must consider whether the area in question was one in need of State assistance.

The future policy must be to concentrate on the provision of the smaller class of house for wage-earners, the house which was so difficult to provide without State assistance. That was the policy of the Government at present; but it did not mean that they would not provide the sort of house required in a particular locality.

Under the Act of 1930, schemes had been passed which would finally lead to clearing away 13,500 slum houses and their replacement by others. The Rural Workers' Acts of 1926 and 1931 provided for the reconditioning of existing cottages. So far, the number of houses dealt with was 4,469. The applications received under the Rural Authorities Act of 1931 for the construction of houses had been 112 in respect of some 2,000 houses.

He denied that there was a substantial relaxation of the assisted housing effort of the Government under the guise of economy considerations. There had been a substantial redirection of effort in order to make sure that the resources available were used for the purposes for which they were most required. In February the number of assisted houses under construction was 38,450, compared with the corresponding figure a year ago of 36,000. He did not yet know the relative position in regard to unassisted houses compared with a year ago, but if there had been a falling-off in that class of building it was due to no fault of the Government. There had been a diminution of the building of the larger type of house, commercial and public building, and in works of maintenance and repair. But this was the result of the general economic condition of the country.

HOUSING ADVOCATED TO AID UNEMPLOYMENT

Those who desire the Government to embark on a vast programme of house building to relieve unemployment in the building trade, irrespective of the cost to the taxpayer, reckon without their Government.

Such a demand might have had great appeal to the Labor Government. But a Government that went into office on the issue of national economy at a time when every drop of energy of the whole nation was directed toward the balancing of the budget and the cutting down of every unnecessary expense could hardly have been expected to have been much impressed by the argument that if the Government entered upon a vast programme of housing activity it would very greatly relieve the unemployment situation.

In response to representations made to him by such distinguished representatives of architecture, the building trades and Labor as Raymond Unwin, Sir J. Walker Smith, George Hicks, Richard Coppock and others, the Minister showed that he fully apprehended the situation that confronted the country.

In reply to their urging that there should be no curtailment of the Government building programme he said that he did not believe that the difficulties in the building industry to which the deputation had called his attention were due to any unreasonable action on the part of the Government. The difficulties were due to a reduction of private, and not public, building programmes which arose from a national consciousness that in the present crisis no expenditure should be incurred which was not profitable for new production, and especially for production for export. The nation realized that a return to general prosperity depended upon the recovery of foreign markets, and the building industry must look to that return for a true remedy for their troubles.

That those groups who have believed in a different policy on the part of the Government will "carry on" with the Government under its new policy goes without saying for every person who understands the British character. It is interesting and significant that the local authorities speaking through a committee of their body of which Alderman Miles Mitchell of Manchester is Chairman, should have announced to the Minister of Health that the local authorities were prepared so far as possible to concentrate in the immediate future on the question of housing the very poorest of their people, and thus carry out the Government's new policy.

THE NEW POLICY ACCEPTED

The housing reformers also have fallen into line and announced their accord with the Government's new policy. The National Housing and Town Planning Council speaking through its Executive Committee have voiced approval of that policy, as set forth by the Minister of Health in his circular to local authorities of January 12th, and have gone so far as to urge the local authorities to continue to fulfill their statutory obligations to provide houses for the working classes as often as occasion arises.

Whether there are to be any material changes in the subsidy to be granted by the Government has not as yet been disclosed, although statements made by the Minister of Health recently would seem to indicate that the Government expects to present to Parliament in the near future a proposed Housing Bill. What form this measure will take is not as yet disclosed.

WHO PAYS FOR GOVERNMENT HOUSING?

We wonder how many of the people who blithely advocate government housing have ever asked themselves who was to pay for it, and have ever sat down with pencil and paper and attempted to calculate the cost of this form of social effort to the taxpayers of the community in which they live.

There has been so little advocacy of government housing in the United States up to the present that we doubt very much whether any of even the most ardent advocates of this extension of governmental function have ever gone through this mental process.

Unless there is a sharp reaction from the squandermania that has been so prevalent in this country in recent years—an undoubted factor in producing the present economic situation and which has found its full expression in the reckless voting of public funds by Congress—there is likelihood that there will be an increasing development of public sentiment, particularly in our large cities, in the direction of public housing.

As more and more Americans see the admirable way in which people in Europe are housed by Government or with government aid, it is only natural for those who have not any vast acquaintance with principles of political economy or of government to urge the adoption of similar measures in the United States.

The contrast between the slum conditions—which many of these people view for the first time and which few of them understand—and

the very satisfactory conditions under which a different class of the population live in those European countries where government housing flourishes, strikes them with almost dramatic effect.

When one reads that since the War nearly a million houses have been built in England and Wales with government aid, and when one views these houses or sees photographs of them and sees what admirable homes they make at what seem to American eyes ridiculously low rents, it is not surprising that a superficial observer should say: "Why can't we do similar things in the United States? Why shouldn't we have Government Housing over here?"

Unfortunately, they never ask themselves who pays for these accommodations and what this paying of people's rent by the taxpayers of a country means to those taxpayers.

When England embarked upon the wholesale building of houses for its people it was immediately after the War and with a very definite obligation resting upon the Government to provide homes for the hundreds of thousands of its citizens who had without thought of consequences to themselves defended their country against an invading foe in the trenches for a number of years.

The Government made no attempt at that time to estimate the cost of the new policy it was embarking upon. It has only been in comparatively recent years that any realization of that cost has been had by the people of England—and even now there is but slight realization by all the people of England of what it means to them.

A little over a year ago the Minister of Health in response to a parliamentary inquiry revealed the fact that the outstanding loan debt of the local authorities in England and Wales on account of housing as of March 31, 1929—the latest date for which figures were then available—was approximately £416,000,000, to which, he stated, must be added considerably over £400,000,000 as the State's share of its liability for housing.

From which it is seen that the taxpayers of England—using the term in the American sense to include the payers of both local and national taxes—are being burdened to pay the interest on over £800,000,000 of debt, solely to enable a special class in the community to live under lower rents than they would otherwise have to pay.

The annual burden that is thus imposed upon the taxpayers of England was disclosed during the same year in the Report of the Committee on National Expenditure set up by the Labor Government then in power to report to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Snowden, the means by which government expenses could be reduced. That Com-

mittee reported that the State or central government was expending during that year the vast sum of £12,735,000 (\$63,675,000 at par) in the form of housing subsidies under the five various Housing Acts passed since 1919.

After reviewing in some detail the expenses upon the Treasury because of these subsidies, the Committee made the following finding:

We view with deep concern this steadily growing charge upon the Exchequer, and the similar though smaller charges on local rates, for the housing of the working classes. There is serious danger of the nation, gradually and without forethought, finding itself committed to the principle that a man's wages are not normally intended to enable him to pay fully for his housing. In our view such a development would be a grave mistake from every point of view, and we can see no ground of principle why it should stop at housing.

Some months ago commenting on these newly disclosed facts as to the burden resting upon the taxpayers of England because of the Government's policy of subsidizing housing, *The National Builder* said that "*it was no exaggeration to say that this generation and our children and their children unto the third generation will be bearing the heavy burden of finding the funds necessary to pay for these houses.*"

It added:

This sum is actually double the annual revenue of the whole of France. It is treble the revenue of the Soviet Republics of Russia. In short, upon one branch only of our social services this nation has involved itself in liabilities that are double the amount spent in a year by the Republic of France on the Army, Navy, Air Service and all the elaborate machinery of French civil bureaucracy.

According to this journal £31,642,000 (\$158,210,000 at par) was spent for housing by the Government in the year 1929, the amount spent for various social services none of which is directly productive being more than double the whole pre-war cost of the National Government, while the purchasing power of money is approximately the same. The amount thus spent for social services, including housing, increased from £60,000,000 a year before the War to nearly £400,000,000 a year in the year 1929.

We would respectfully refer those who earnestly advocate the adoption of a programme of public housing in the United States to these practical examples of what public housing costs in a country where institutions are more similar to those in the United States than will be found in any other country.

We think that all advocates of government housing will be much enlightened by recent studies of government housing in practice in

England made by William L. Hare, Editor of *Garden Cities and Town Planning*, and published in the August and November 1930 issues of that journal.

In these two articles Mr. Hare turns the spotlight of clear reason upon the problems involved. In one he reviews 10-years of housing effort in England from 1919 to 1929 and presents in tabular form the facts with regard to England's effort in this field in that 10-year period, showing the number of houses built by the local authorities, by private enterprise assisted by Government aid, by private enterprise unassisted, by building associations and the cost to the State of houses under these various forms of effort.

In the second article he discusses the system of housing finance in vogue in England and reviews the whole subject, taking as the theme of his discourse a suggestion made by a member of the City Council of Norwich, who suggests that huge payments for interest should be abolished and that houses should be built on "ready money" furnished by the local authorities.

We commend to all persons who have leanings toward "public housing" this illuminating discussion of the problems of housing finance and of what is involved in having the State and the municipality enter the housing field.

A HOUSING "DOLE"

Where Government Housing leads—and where it is sure to lead in the long run in every country—was dramatically shown to the people of England about a year ago when facts were made public by the officials of the London County Council with regard to their housing schemes.

It was shown at that time that the equivalent of 6s a week was paid by the taxpayers on the average to each of the 37,000 tenants of the London County Council's cottages and flats, the population thus receiving this "hidden dole" in the form of an uneconomic rent being over 213,000. The cost of housing these 213,000 tenants—the equivalent of the population of a good sized town in England, practically the population of either Cardiff or Croyden—resulted in a deficiency for the year ending March 31, 1931, of over £674,000 (\$3,370,000 at par). This vast sum represents the difference between the actual cost of housing these tenants on an economic basis without profit and the actual rents that were paid by them. Of this loss the taxpayers of Great Britain as a whole pay nearly 3/5 and the taxpayers of London pay but 2/5. The average deficiency on each letting was £16 7s 5d.

How difficult it is for the community to stop when it has once started on a career of municipal housing is brought home by the fact that the London County Council, the largest local authority in England, and which has developed housing facilities for their constituents on a greater scale than any other community, has already expended over £36,567,000 (\$182,835,000 at par) in its housing schemes.

It is stated authoritatively that 1 out of every 10 of the population of London will in a short time—when the present housing schemes of the London County Council are carried out—be living in a house or flat built and owned by the community and subsidized up to a third part of the economic rental by the taxpayers of England and of that community.

That this great departure from the functions of government as conceived by the founders of this country and as conceived by the English people until recent years may lead to disastrous results is not difficult to believe.

In fact there are already indications of some of the consequences that may flow from this extension of governmental functions.

A SOURCE OF POLITICAL CORRUPTION

It is pointed out by a correspondent of a London journal that there are already 800,000 municipal tenants in England and that these tenants are a possible source of political corruption, that in the 800,000 "Council houses" that have been built there are usually 2 and often 3 or 4 voters. He adds that already efforts have been made, especially in the West of Scotland and in the North of England, to organize these voters into Local Tenants' Associations.

These demand lower rents and threaten that if their demands are not granted they will swing a solid block of votes for or against certain candidates. He adds that this menace is already serious in local politics. He further states that in many cases tenants who are content to accept an indirect "dole" in the form of an uneconomic rent become an easy prey to socialist canvassers and are duped by the idea that Socialism will bring them further material benefits.

During the short time that the United States indulged in the luxury of Government Housing during the War it had the same experience with its tenants in some of the government schemes in the Philadelphia district. At the time of the War houses had been rented to these workers in order to speed up the construction of ships and munitions, and after the War they were allowed to purchase them from the Government. Almost the first thing that happened was an organized agi-

tation directed specifically to Congress to reduce the selling price of these houses, to relieve the tenants from taxes which their fellow citizens in the same city were called upon to pay, and in general to do the very things that it is feared will soon be urged in England.

That this is likely to happen in any country governed by majority rule and is sure to operate under a democratic form of government, is so obvious that it would hardly seem to need argument.

Exactly the same thing happened in the city of Liverpool about a year ago. There, some 10,000 tenants of houses belonging to the City petitioned the Minister of Health for a reduction in rent—notwithstanding the fact that the rents charged were already below those which private enterprise would charge for equal accommodations, and according to the Chairman of the Housing Committee of the Corporation were already a heavy charge on the local taxpayers and also on the taxpayers of the nation as well. The petitioners urged that their rents should be reduced on the ground that there had been a change in the cost of living since the time when rents were fixed and the Acts under which the buildings constructed were passed. They apparently held the view that because wages are necessarily more or less closely related to the cost of living that decrease in wage rates consequent upon a lower cost of living should imply a necessary lowering of rent.

GOVERNMENT SLUMS

That there are other serious aspects connected with Government Housing is evidenced by the information furnished a few months ago to the effect that the Ministry of Health in England is very much concerned at the increasing cost of maintenance of its municipal housing estates. Under one of the housing laws as much as 15% of the rent may be set aside in order to provide a fund for maintenance and repairs. Experience shows, however, that this sum is proving to be quite inadequate on many of the municipal estates. On one of these the actual cost of repairs was 21% of the net rent; on another over 20%. In a city in Wales some 30% of the new "Council houses" are already said to be verminous. It is added that the problem is becoming serious. For, unless action is taken, many of the "Council houses" erected since the War will have degenerated into slums before the loans are finally paid off. These loans in the case of many of the houses are spread over a period of 60 years.

The situation is so serious that it is even suggested that a system be adopted that prevails in the Army by which damages to property shall be paid for by the occupants and that the tenants of these "Coun-

cil houses" should contribute toward repairs made necessary by carelessness, dirty habits or bad usage.

These are the problems that every private landlord has known all about for years and has had to deal with as a landlord. It seems rather naïve for the city authorities to discover this fact only at this late day. Anybody proposing to go into the business of building and managing houses for rental to tenants, especially working class tenants, it would seem should certainly have realized these elements in the situation.

All of which would seem to point a moral and adorn a tale.

SLUM CLEARANCE WORK SLOWED UP IN ENGLAND

Another instance of the limitations of entrusting to Government the task of housing the people of any community is found in England at the present time.

Two years ago an ambitious scheme of slum clearance was launched by the then Government which it was fondly hoped would wipe out England's slums in a reasonable time.

Two years have elapsed since that measure became a law; and as might have been expected, very little or nothing has been done under it as yet. This is not due solely to the fact that the country has been facing a financial and economic crisis during the past year, nor to the fact that there has been a revolutionary change in the make up of the Government, but is due to the difficulties inherent in the problem itself—the inertia that needs to be overcome, the necessarily slow procedure that must be followed where property rights are involved.

Notwithstanding that that Act had its "Five-year Plan", and that under it every Borough and Urban District with over 20,000 population was required to make and submit to the Government a complete housing programme to meet their needs and to resubmit such a programme every 5 years, according to official statements made in Parliament as recently as March but 150 local authorities out of 1800 local authorities in England and Wales had transmitted resolutions to the Ministry of Health declaring areas in their districts to be slum clearance areas under the Housing Act of 1930.

The latest information available is as of March 31st. The spokesman for the Ministry of Health in the House of Commons on April 5th in response to a parliamentary question stated that up to that date the Ministry of Health had received resolutions declaring 408 areas in England and Wales to be clearance areas under the Housing Act of 1930, the clearance of these areas involving the displacement and

rehousing of approximately 68,000 persons. In connection with such areas it was stated that but 269 clearance or compulsory orders had been submitted to the Ministry of Health. An earlier statement giving information up to the end of last year showed that 308 houses had been demolished in the areas in question under the act, and that the amount paid by the State towards the cost of this slum clearance during the year 1931 had been £83,672 (\$418,360 at par) and the ultimate annual State liability was roughly estimated at £280,000 (\$1,400,000 at par).

Small as these results are compared with what had been expected, they are an advance over what had been achieved in the past in dealing with this difficult problem. The Minister of Health two years ago in discussing the 1930 Act in the House of Commons stated that in the 30 years prior to 1919 but 75 slum clearance schemes had been confirmed by the Ministry, and in the 10 years subsequent to that time only 121, of which but 43 had been completed, the number of approved schemes involving but 15,000 buildings and the rehousing of 74,000 persons. Speaking a year later the Minister of Health revised these figures by stating that during the 11 years since the Armistice approximately 11,000 houses had been demolished under improvement and reconstruction schemes undertaken by the local authorities in England and Wales.

LEGAL OBSTACLES—PROPERTY RIGHTS

Even were there no serious financial situation confronting the people of England and even if there had been no recent change of Government, slum clearance would in that country face the difficulties that it would face to some extent in America.

This has been evidenced by the action of the courts in the case of two schemes that have been before them recently under the Housing Act of 1930. One of these was in the densely populated workingman's quarter of Poplar, notorious for the radical views of its inhabitants and for the fact that the district is occupied almost entirely by the lower-paid income group, and therefore with very slight financial resources.

It appears that in this case the local authorities, the Poplar Borough Council made an order for the demolition of a dwelling house, under §22 of the Housing Act of 1930. The owner appealed against this order claiming that the house was not unfit for habitation and that it could be made fit at a reasonable cost.

Upon his appeal to the County Court, the court adjourned the case for four months with the understanding that certain repairs which the

owner had claimed would make the dwelling fit for habitation would in the meantime be carried out. These were in due course reported upon by the public officials as having been carried out in a satisfactory manner. The court thereupon quashed the order made by the Borough Council and directed them to pay the costs of the action.

The case is an excellent illustration of the dangers inherent in granting to Government even these very proper and necessary powers. The Government of any country seldom rises above its source, and here we find government officials in as well governed a country as England recklessly disregarding the provisions of the law under which they are operating and acting according to their own wishes and impulses.

It is exactly the sort of thing that characterizes the action of Boards of Zoning Appeals in the United States, and is, unfortunately, getting to be characteristic of many public officials and local governments. It seems to be an attribute of bureaucracy.

In the case in question it is quite obvious that the local authorities made no effort to determine whether the house could be made fit for human habitation by reasonable alterations before ordering it to be demolished. Like the Red Queen in "Alice" they preferred to cry "Off with his head."

A somewhat similar case was decided by the English Court of Appeal a few months earlier where the local authorities at Ilkeston had similarly issued a demolition order with regard to a dwelling house in which they stated that they were satisfied that the house was unfit for human habitation. From this order the owner appealed to the county court judge, as provided under the 1930 Act, who found as a matter of fact that the house was capable at reasonable expense of being rendered fit for human habitation and upon an agreement on the part of the owner to carry out the necessary repairs quashed the demolition order.

From this decision of the county court the local authorities appealed to the appellate court. That court in a unanimous decision handed down a few months ago dismissed the appeal holding that the county court judge was fully entitled to deal with the question of whether the house could be made fit at reasonable expense.

From which it is evident that, notwithstanding the vast powers which Parliament under the 1930 Act has conferred upon the local authorities in dealing with slums, it is not "roses, roses all the way" but that the problem must be dealt with fairly and with caution and respect for the rights of the property owners concerned—a lesson which it is hoped that the local authorities in England will speedily learn.

It is this fear of ill-considered and lawless action by local authorities in the United States, were such powers conferred upon them, that has prevented ardent advocates of housing reform and slum clearance in that country from seeking the granting of these powers.

RENT DOLES

“DIFFERENTIAL RENTS”

When Government commences to interfere with economic law it is not long before it is led into all sorts of strange paths. Nothing could be more definitely illustrative of this than what has happened in England in the attempt to interfere with the operation of the law of supply and demand through artificial control of rents by Government.

One of the novel and highly controversial features of the English Housing Act of 1930 was the elaborate scheme therein provided of subsidizing rents and of a scheme under which different rents were to be charged to different people situated under the same circumstances and renting the same kind of accommodations but whose ability to pay differed.

Among housing reformers in England there is a very definite school that believes firmly in the application of this principle. They consider that the applying of different rents to different persons in the social scale is the real solution of England's housing problem.

They seem to lose sight of the fact that this is not a matter that should be dealt with as a housing problem but as a problem of social dependence.

Such a plan elaborately worked out was urged by Dr. Millard, the Medical Officer of Health of the City of Leicester, a little over 2 years ago prior to the introduction in Parliament of the Government's Housing Bill of 1930. It appears that such a plan of rent rebates or discrimination in rents in the form of “children's rent allowances” had been in operation at Welwyn Garden City since 1924—long enough to test out its success. There this plan was maintained in connection with 300 houses owned by the Urban District Council and 223 owned by Public Utility Societies. Six pence (6d) a week rebate on the rent was allowed for each child under 14 years of age—extended to 16 years of age if the child remained at school—and 1s a week extra was charged for each authorized lodger. In the aggregate of 523 houses on a weekly rent roll of £368 11s 8d the rebate for children amounted to £20 17s a week, and the extra payment for lodgers amounted to £3 11s a week. The largest rebate in any one family had been £10 8s a year in respect of

8 children—a material help during the period of maximum financial stringency in the life of the family.

A similar scheme was tried out by the Kensington Housing Trust in London in one of its new blocks of flats beginning in September 1929. The principle applied there was that differential rents were fixed according to the financial needs of the family—in this case not granted as children's rent allowances but rather as a cost of living allowance—in other words, a definite subsidy in the form of charitable relief toward the maintenance of the home.

The latest experiment of this kind to be reported upon is the action taken by the local authorities in the city of Cambridge which in 1929—prior to the enactment of the Housing Act of 1930 with its scheme of differential rents and children's allowances—carried out such a plan in connection with 80 families moved by the Public Health Committee from insanitary, defective or overcrowded homes into new quarters.

This Committee found that some of the tenants whom they wished to rehouse—80 out of a total of 1280 families—would be unable to pay the normal rent. They, therefore, obtained permission in 1929 to allow these tenants a rebate of rent provided the tenants could prove their inability to pay the normal rent.

Of the 80 families, approximately one-half obtained rent reductions varying from 1s to 5s per week for houses rented at from 6s 9d to 8s 3d per week.

It is reported that this rebate has had the effect of increasing the burden on the local tax payers from £3 15s per house, as contemplated by the 1924 Act, to over £7 per house. In other words it has practically doubled the tax burden.

Finding that this imposes too heavy a burden, it has recently been decided to modify the amount of the rebate and make it a little less generous. In future only a man employed full time and earning the local wage of a laborer and having 4 or more children will be granted a rent allowance. In reaching these determinations consideration is given to the family income and to local taxes and insurance.

It is recognized that this is in its nature a temporary scheme and the hope is expressed by the local authorities that they may be able gradually in time to bring these lower paid families under the same conditions as the other tenants of the corporation and put them all on a uniform basis.

It may be wise social policy to make these reductions in rent for those families who are so situated that they cannot pay the rent that should be paid and who should be properly housed.

The only criticism we have of the method employed is that this should be frankly recognized for what it is—a rent dole or a direct subsidy or grant by the local authorities for relief from the point of view of the social welfare of the family and the community.

NOTHING GAINED BY “RIBBON” DEVELOPMENT

Some years ago Raymond Unwin startled the building industry and the public officials of England by his challenging article which he entitled “Nothing Gained by Overcrowding.” In that article he not only demonstrated conclusively that the ordinary commercial type of site planning was not only disadvantageous to the community but not advantageous to the property holders who were to live there.

It is particularly fitting now that his son, Edwin Unwin, should announce a new thesis “Nothing Gained by ‘Ribbon’ Development.”

Following in his distinguished father’s footsteps, he presented at a recent meeting of the British Town Planning Institute a Paper entitled “Social, Aesthetic and Economic Comparison of Grouped and Ribbon Forms of Development”* in which he demonstrated quite effectively that the cost of development to be borne by the property holder was less on a 40 ft. builder’s road than it was on a 100-ft. arterial road, and that there was really nothing gained by continuing any longer to permit the countryside to be ruined by the “ribbon” development that has become so prevalent in England to-day and that has followed along the development of new highways, greatly to the detriment of their amenities.

Mr. Unwin’s discussion of the subject was really a discussion of the problems involved in road design and road building. He expressed a point of view that we are sure found an immediate response from his hearers that the problem of the future would be found in “by-passing the by-passes”.

Coming to the question of “ribbon” development, he pointed out that in the case of the Barnet by-pass, the well known new development not far from London, that in a distance of 4 miles, the length of that by-pass, 3½ miles of it had its frontages completely occupied by buildings. In that distance there were 11 direct cross roads, 31 side turnings, and 2 new shopping centers with shops fronting directly on the main arterial road. He pointed out that a similar situation existed in the case of other major by-pass roads.

Mr. Unwin then proceeded to submit comparative estimates of the cost per house of road development and other improvements on differ-

* *Journal of the Town Planning Institute*, March 1932, 11 Arundel Street, London.

ent types of site layouts, using two types of units of frontages of 32 ft. In the one case there was a garage including a concrete drive from the carriage way, as found in the Barnet by-pass; in the other case there was no such garage or carriage way. For each of these classes of development he showed the cost—obtained from estimates based on diagrams and plans formulated after examination and measurement of frontages, waste frontage at junctions, distances between junctions, positions of sewers &c. on the Barnet by-pass development. Then he showed the cost per house on arterial roads contrasted with this; the cost per house on service roads by the side of the arterial road—similar to the roads that give access off the Bronx Parkway to the houses that abut upon it; the same cost deducting the expense of foot paths; then the cost on an ordinary 40-ft. builder's road; then on a cul-de-sac.

It was disclosed as a result of these studies that the cost of development on a 40-ft. builder's road was considerably less than on a 100-ft. arterial road—in the first case a cost of £75 18s 10d per house as compared with a cost of £98 5s 8d on an arterial road. And this was notwithstanding the fact that on a 40-ft. road the whole cost of the road itself was included, and that on the arterial road it was omitted.

The service road was found to be the most expensive method, especially where foot paths were included. The most economical method of all was found by the cul-de-sac plan of development.

20,000 PEOPLE IN A RIBBON

Mr. Unwin may have been said to have employed the *argumentum ad absurdum* by contrasting the establishment of a community of 20,000 people by "ribbon" development along a main arterial highway, as compared with the housing of a similar population in a Satellite Town developed according to modern town planning principles.

He pointed out that the housing of such a population in such a town would consist of about 5,000 houses and occupy at an average density of rather less than 8 to the acre one square mile. Adding 10% for shopping centres etc. and 10% for open spaces inside the town, they thus had a town occupying 1.2 square miles.

Such a town could support a really good shopping centre, several elementary schools, a secondary school, clubs, a good cinema and probably some sort of theatre. Nobody in such a development need be more than half a mile from the shops, churches, town hall etc. They would all be less than a half mile from an elementary school and not more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile from a secondary school. The open country would

be not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ a mile away, and those traveling to other places by road would only have a similar distance, on the average, to drive to built-up areas, and then a clear country main road.

It was not too much to say, he pointed out, that such people would be able to enjoy most of the advantages of town life combined with many of those of country life. What was true of shops would also be true of schools, entertainments, clubs, libraries, and all those things which went to make up the advantages of town life.

He added that the contrast was so complete and the idea of 20,000 people ever going to live in one long "ribbon" development, *if they were given any choice*, was so absurd that it would be a waste of time to discuss it further.

American town planners will find Mr. Unwin's Paper full of meat and will find it advantageous to study its details as published in the *Journal of the Town Planning Institute* for March, 1932.

COSTLY STREET WIDENING

They will also be interested in some extremely interesting facts presented by Fred Marsden at a recent meeting of that Institute in discussing the street widenings that were likely to be carried out in the near future at Letchworth. He gave some very interesting and valuable figures with regard to the cost of such widenings, as compared with the cost of making the roads originally a sufficient width to include widenings that might ultimately be needed. He reaches the conclusion from these studies that a road 60% wider costs but 10% more where the width of the footways and carriageways is the same in both cases.

He gives figures showing the comparative cost per mile of street widenings and new roads in three English cities, Bradford, Leeds and Liverpool. These show that in Liverpool the new road cost per mile is only about 30% of the widening cost, £15,145 against £52,380. In Leeds it is similarly 30%, £60,000 against £200,000, and in Bradford about 50%, £64,590 against £133,049.

He also presents interesting facts with regard to the money saved by town planning. He shows that the total cost per house of an estate developed upon the ordinary stereotyped lines practiced by the commercial builder and developer is £95 per house, including the cost of making the estate roads and of private street work, as compared with a cost of £33 per house, including similar costs, where such estates are developed upon town planning lines.

American town planners will find much food for thought in Mr. Marsden's figures.

THE OCTOPUS AND ITS TENTACLES

GROWTH IN THE LONDON REGION

Statements made in the press a few weeks ago by Raymond Unwin with regard to the work of the Greater London Regional Planning Committee, to which he is Technical Adviser, called attention to the fact that the important work of this Committee—started four years ago for the purpose of developing a comprehensive plan for Greater London and the Region within a radius of 25 miles from its centre—had narrowly escaped coming to an untimely end in the present financial crisis, but that the decision of the London County Council to renew its grant, although on a very much reduced scale, made it possible for the work to be continued.

On this occasion Mr. Unwin pointed out that even with a reduced budget of expenditure it seemed likely that it would be possible to keep up to date the surveys already made, and in due course to issue the Report on the proposed Planning of the Area, for which much of the material is already prepared. He expressed regret, however, that the work had to be curtailed at a time when rapid and vast increases in population made it more urgent than ever that a planned scheme for the whole area should be produced.

According to Mr. Unwin, the population of Greater London by the 1931 census is 9,144,093—an increase of nearly 1,000,000 over that of 10 years earlier. Of this increase about 350,000 is due to immigration. At the same time during this period there has been a movement outward which combined with other causes since 1921 has increased the population of the region outside the London County Council area by 1,005,999 persons.

What this shifting of population involves in problems to the local authorities and particularly to the London County Council Mr. Unwin points out as follows:

The relative responsibilities for housing, education, health, etc., of the London County Council and of the 130 local authorities in the outer area; the best way to co-ordinate their efforts and those of private enterprise; and a proper relation between industrial and housing development; are some of such problems. The necessary transport for these large numbers and the enormous volume of unnecessary movement—due to the haphazard character of the sporadic building, and to the want of proper relations between the people's dwelling, working and playing places—present other serious problems. Another problem urgently raised by the present disorganized development is that of preserving open space for the growing population. To provide ade-

quately for the games and active recreation merely of the 1,000,000 increase in population 7,000 acres, or nearly 11 square miles, of suitable land would have been needed, in addition to a reasonable provision in parks or rural reserves.

Mr. Unwin's statement at this time calls attention anew to the remarkable Report submitted by him as Technical Adviser to the Greater London Regional Planning Committee on the subject of Decentralization, in the form of an Interim Report made about a year ago. This Report, while a report on Decentralization, is in reality a discussion of the problems involved in the growth of great cities and the distribution of population and industry.

While dealing specifically with the Region in a 25-mile radius around London, the facts presented, the problems discussed, and the general method of handling the problem by Mr. Unwin are so unusually valuable and have thus far had such little attention by American town planners and housing practitioners that we are reproducing here the complete Report,* in very large part.

The Report is divided into three sections. Part I concerns itself with the Movement of Population, Part II with the Promotion of Co-ordinated Development in the form of Satellite units, and Part III contains Summaries of the Findings in Part I and II, with Mr. Unwin's Conclusions as to the remedies for the situation.

* See pages 117-134.

THE GROWTH OF LONDON

REPORT ON DECENTRALIZATION

By SIR RAYMOND UNWIN, P. R. I. B. A.



“It is estimated that over 2,000,000,000 journeys are made in London every year by workers going to and from their work, and the actual amount of money that is spent on these journeys is well over £20,000,000 per year”—Ewart G. Culpin, Alderman and Member of the London County Council.

The problem remitted to this sub-committee may perhaps be summarised shortly as follows: How to secure a better distribution of population and industry throughout the Region.

It is recognised that this constitutes the basic problem of any plan for Greater London; and that much further work will be needed before a final report dealing with the whole subject can be presented. The study so far carried out has, however, brought into prominence certain aspects of the problem and has enabled some preliminary conclusions to be reached. As these concern matters which are specially urgent at the present time, this Interim Report* has been prepared.

It is generally recognised that the growth of large towns by means of unregulated accretions round the fringe must produce increasing congestion and confusion of parts in the town. Serious obstruction and delay to internal traffic, and waste of time and energy in travelling to and fro between the dwellings and the places of industry, business or recreation are among the chief evils, though by no means the only ones, which result. The want of co-ordination and the sporadic nature of the development involve local authorities and supplying companies in the great unnecessary cost of distributing all the services over large areas; and a volume of movement to and fro of people and goods is caused which better location of industries, dwellings, etc., would prevent.

In London, where the development of motor traffic is still in an early stage compared with that reached in America, the street congestion, the loss of life, and the loss of time and money caused through delay, are already most serious. Existing roads and other traffic facilities are overloaded, and a stage has been reached when increased facilities are liable to add to the congestion as much as or more than they relieve it. On the lines of unchecked increase in movement, either

* *Greater London Regional Planning Committee. Interim Report on Decentralisation, January, 1931. Knapp Drewitt and Sons, Ltd. 30, Victoria-street, S.W.1., London. Price 6d.*

in volume or in distance travelled, no remedy is at present in sight. Hence the importance of seeking to bring work places and living places into better relation generally and to localise the major part of the life and activities of the people.

There are certain theoretical considerations as to the general form of a growing town inseparable from the problem of distribution. The study of the Region confirms the view that in spite of the sporadic character of the development three definite tendencies may be recognised.

(a) There is the tendency for new development to take place around the fringe of existing development.

(b) There is a marked tendency for development to follow main radial roads outwards.

(c) There is also a noticeable tendency for new units of development to spring up detached from the main mass of the town. This is so common as to form one of the characteristic ways by which a town expands. The units sometimes develop round an old village or small town; but frequently they are stimulated by a railway station and develop in a new place, with a definite business centre of their own. Even where development straggles out along a main road it is often characterised by this detached unit character, the units tending to join up subsequently and form continuous development.

In so far as method (a) of accretion operates, the town grows as a continuous mass. In so far as method (b) prevails, it tends to form a star shape. To the extent that method (c) holds good, it takes the form of a central mass with satellite units springing up at a distance; and by their mutual growth the mass and the satellites ultimately coalesce.

It is clear that any growth taking the form of continuous accretions round the fringe, must tend to produce constriction and to upset the balance of parts and the relations of the different functions in the central area. This method of growth is largely responsible for the increasing distances that separate dwelling places from industries and business and from places of recreation. The star shaped form of growth has the advantage of leaving areas of open land more readily accessible to a larger proportion of the town. It is, however, equally subject to the objection that it grows by accretions round what is but a longer fringe. Such growth is constantly upsetting the balance and removing the existing parts of the town further and further from access to open ground. Moreover, the area of land which may be covered by development while still leaving adequate open space between the rays of the star is relatively small.

The third form of development by new units seems to offer theoretically the most satisfactory method of growth after the central mass of a town has reached a certain size. This form occurs as naturally as either of the others. It may be encouraged and the character of the units preserved by the permanent reservation of belts of open space to prevent the units coalescing with one another or with the central mass. If in addition the development of these units could be planned and organised to be as complete and self-contained as possible so that the life of the people living in them, their work and their recreation, might be largely localised, a general type of development would be secured likely to reduce unnecessary movement and to minimise the difficulties of traffic congestion. The study of the industrial and other practical considerations affecting the problem appears generally to confirm this view and to suggest that the solution to many of the difficulties must be found in appropriate forms of co-ordinated decentralisation.

Investigation has revealed that a considerable volume of industry is either settling anew in the Greater London Region, or is for one reason or another moving to new sites on the outskirts of inner London; and that a very large population is at the same time settling in outer London. So large are these movements that the question of co-ordinating the mass of sporadic development which has resulted is one of overwhelming urgency. This tends to put somewhat in the background for the present the question of how far industries already settled in London could be induced to move outwards. It is found that large numbers of new industries are settling in certain areas, and that one of the chief complaints made by those operating them relates to the want of housing accommodation sufficiently near. At the same time large numbers of workmen's houses are being erected in other parts of the Region, where little industrial employment is available. This part of the problem, owing to its urgency, seemed to call for first consideration; and it is dealt with in Part I of the Report which follows. The result of the investigation was that certain conclusions were reached as to the need for development in co-ordinated units. Attention was then directed to the means which could be employed to secure the kind of development that appeared desirable. This aspect of the matter is dealt with in Part II of the report. A summary and the conclusions are given in Part III.

PART I

THE MOVEMENT OF POPULATION

The work of the Committee at first appeared to involve the active promotion of decentralisation. Examination of the figures for population and industry in the Region has revealed, however, that a considerable movement of people into the Region has set in since the 1921 census. This, added to the movement from the centre outward which has been maintained, constitutes a large volume of population redistributing itself. It has been found, moreover, that many new industries are springing up in the Region or moving into it and that others are moving out from the centre to find space for expansion. This great volume of movement has suggested that the immediate problem before the Committee is not that of promoting an extensive movement out from London of people and industries already settled there. The more urgent matter is to secure a better distribution and location of those people and industries already impelled to move. Though more urgent, this part of the problem is simpler; for to induce a manufacturer to tear up an industry which is firmly rooted in some district, which has gathered about it the required labor, found its relation with transport, markets, etc., is obviously a difficult task—one very different in character from that of offering a good locality to a manufacturer who for one reason or another is already compelled to make a change.

The volume of this existing movement is large enough to tax all the available resources. While there are no complete figures, records have been obtained of the initiation since the war of new workshops and factories employing 132,515 hands. On a moderate basis that number of industrial workers must directly affect a population of 400,000. If the people indirectly affected be added, probably the number may safely be increased to 500,000. This means that since the War in our Region industrial undertakings have been started or moved from one locality to another which, if located in suitably organised industrial suburbs or satellite units, would have represented 16 complete towns of about 30,000, 10 towns of 50,000, or 5 towns of 100,000 inhabitants.

In regard to the distribution of population, still larger numbers have moved into new dwellings erected since 1919. We have records of the building of 334,096 dwellings within the Region, representing the housing or rehousing of over $1\frac{1}{4}$ million people. The increase of population and the known movement outwards due to its reduction in some

central areas, still appear to call for something like 18,000 dwellings per annum, without allowing for any arrears or the replacement of houses that are worn out or cleared to provide for other buildings. This represents the population of one or two satellite towns per annum.

In the period from the 1921 Census to March, 1929, it is estimated that there have settled in Greater London outside the County Area 598,667 people, made up as follows: total natural increase 421,857; moved out of the County Area by diminution of the actual population 94,280; moved in from outside the Region 82,530.

Without needing, therefore, in the first instance to face the difficulty of tearing up settled industry or population by the roots, there is already sufficient movement of both to tax and to test the powers of controlled distribution. It is proposed, therefore, to estimate the conditions determining distribution mainly in relation to this more fluid section of the community.

While we cannot claim to have made any complete analysis of industry in the London Region, conditions in regard to 40 or 50 manufacturing firms have been studied and discussed with their heads or managers. These firms have included a large proportion who have moved their industries, started new industries in the area, or have considered the question of moving and decided for the time being against it. Collating the results of these inquiries, and eliminating special conditions applying only to certain of the industries, there emerge a few predominating considerations which mainly determine their movement and location. It will be found that central positions have some clear advantages; others equally clear attach to outside locations. Many conditions are however capable of being greatly influenced by planning and similar public activities. The balance of advantage and disadvantage of central and outside location for many industries will depend on how these conditions are dealt with.

The conditions will be considered under a few main headings such as: (1) Labor Supply; (2) Space for expansion and character of sites; (3) Transport facilities; (4) Relation to markets for products; (5) Location generally.

LABOR SUPPLY

Labor is mobile; with sufficient time and trouble a supply can be obtained almost anywhere. Nevertheless the success of industry depends so largely on the adequacy and efficiency of labor, and this in turn depends so much on the conditions of life available for the workers,

that it is proposed to deal first with the conditions affecting decentralization under the head of Labor.

Favoring a position in or immediately adjacent to a large town, the following points were frequently mentioned:

(a) The advantage afforded by a large pool of labor of all kinds on which to draw. Valuable for all, it is specially so for seasonal industries and facilitates rapid expansion or the prompt manning of new departments. The advantage in regard to fluctuating demand or seasonal variations is greater where the pool is made up of a large variety of industries whose fluctuations may be expected to balance each other to some extent. Similarly, a large assortment of industry is more likely to provide suitable work for men, women, boys and girls. It is specially difficult for labor to move with a factory to a place where only one class of labor is employed, and where other members of the families may not find employment.

(b) In a large pool workmen are more likely to gain valuable experience in different factories. If they lose a job they have more choice of alternative employment.

(c) It is suggested that the more enterprising men and the supervising staff prefer to live and work in large pools, where the opportunities for advancement are more numerous than they would be in a small satellite unit.

(d) The opportunities for education, especially commercial and technical training, are greater in the large towns. It is stated by way of example that the facilities afforded in the L.C.C. colleges are only open to dwellers outside the County area on payment of higher fees. It is suggested that consequently the employer is more dependent on training his own skilled workers, if he is not able to draw his labor easily from such a large pool.

(e) Where night shifts must be worked, it is thought that greater provision for the life of night workers will be found in large towns; and a tradition of night work as a normal circumstance will reduce the difficulty of staffing night shifts.

(f) The preference of the workers and staff for the life and stir of a large town; the greater extent and variety of indoor entertainments, cinemas, theatres, music, etc., are frequently given as reasons for the difficulty of inducing workpeople to move out of town to new settlements, whether suburban or satellite in character.

While the larger pool of workers, better opportunities for training, and more entertainment are clearly circumstances favorable to location in the large town, testimony as to concurrent drawbacks is not wanting.

The extensive and varied opportunities for employment which create a large pool of labor to draw upon, also create more intensive competition for workers in busy times—and promote a tendency among employees to change employment for slight reason—often merely for the sake of change.

The general experience of those who have moved to Letchworth, Welwyn or similar places is that whatever difficulties they may have had in persuading men to move, once settled, the labor is more contented and more efficient. One manufacturer said that if they had difficulty in persuading the staff to come, they would have far more in persuading them to go back. The health of the worker is decidedly

better and there is much less lost time. As one manufacturer put it, "Here my men work for me; in London they work for an employer." Another stated that he found men tired by long journeys into or across London. They were increasingly dissatisfied with a crowded tenement, and desired a self-contained cottage and garden. One manufacturer said there was too much competition for labor in Brixton. He could expand if he could rely on a larger regular supply of the right labor. Another testimony to the value of settled labor came from an employer, mainly of women, girls and boys, who settled in a neighborhood largely occupied by railway men because of the good settled class of families from which he could draw.

While general technical training should be available, more than one manufacturer expressed the view that they obtained better workers by training them up in their own works and ways than by drawing ready-trained men from a pool.

Apart from the attraction of a garden, which all can have in a satellite settlement and few in the town, the comparative scarcity of indoor entertainments is balanced by the much greater opportunities for outdoor games and pleasures of all kinds, which are far more valuable for promoting health and efficiency among workers. The general recognition of the value of open air games is shown by the extent to which firms try to provide playing fields for their men outside London, often at great expense and involving long journeys.

While employers may like to promote *esprit de corps* among their workers, it is said that many of the latter prefer to get away from the associations and companions of their working hours into fresh living surroundings. It is urged that for this reason they prefer to lose themselves in the large pool. On the other hand, there is equally emphatic testimony that a large number of workers, though they may not like to live on the factory doorstep, value very highly a location near enough to enable them to go home for their mid-day dinner; and that they regard time spent in travelling to and from their labor only in the light of a necessary evil.

In regard to night work, a home quite near the work seems to be a greater advantage than the efforts made in large towns to mitigate the disadvantages of night working for those who live away.

In regard to the attractions of the city especially for young people, some employers point out that the attraction is mainly for clerks, typists, waitresses, messengers, and that this tends to reduce the available supply of girl and boy industrial workers.

In regard to labor, it is clear that many arguments are little more than generalisations based on particular experience. Perhaps the position may be summed up, not unfairly, as follows: Many successful industries are carried on in places where they offer the sole chance of employment. There are some advantages for the employers which go with this circumstance; also considerable risks both for employer and workmen.

It is clear also that there is advantage in a sufficiently large pool of labor to reduce the risks, and to allow some chance for slack or busy trades or seasonal fluctuations to result in a fairly steady average of employment. Equally evident, however, are the disadvantages which may develop when the pool grows too large, and the dwelling places and the work places become too far apart.

The testimony to the better health, better time keeping, greater contentment and absence of restlessness of the workers living in Garden City conditions was quite general, and equally emphatically given by a group of employers who in other respects criticised from the employers' point of view some of the conditions in the Garden Cities.

In the majority of cases, where difficulty in regard to obtaining labor was referred to, it was found that whatever other reasons are put forward want of adequate local housing was the main cause of the difficulty. Out of 14 firms interviewed in the Greenford—Hayes—Slough district no less than 11 laid special emphasis on the need for more housing accomodation. There can be no doubt that all other difficulties are quite secondary to this one and that many of them are mainly due to it.

It is noticeable that the want of housing accommodation is so severely felt by manufacturers that a number of them expressed a willingness to pay a substantial contribution towards the loss sustained by the local authority in building houses, provided that they might be allowed to nominate employees as occupants. A subvention of £5 per house per annum was suggested in more than one case as a sum which the employers would be willing to pay.

The need for better co-ordination between housing accommodation and industrial development clearly emerges. There are to be found extensive new industries in one district with little provision of houses for the workers; and extensive housing development in other areas with little sign of new local employment. It is this haphazard condition that is mainly responsible for the labor difficulties of which those starting new industries complain.

If units of industry of sufficient size were combined with housing adequate to form a reasonably sized pool in relation to the industry; and were laid out and equipped with shops, schools, entertainments, etc., appropriate for a self-contained unit of 40,000, 50,000 or even 100,000 people, it is safe to say that most of the difficulties as to securing labor referred to above would never arise; and that much of the contentment and efficiency testified in regard to Garden City labor could be secured.

SPACE FOR EXPANSION

There are several other aspects of the matter to be considered before the possibilities of co-ordination can be dealt with. The investigations show that the reason almost universally given for the movement of a factory or industry is the want of space to expand, sufficiently near to the old site.

Sometimes other reasons reinforce the simple want of space, such as the need for better arrangement of processes; the economy which in many industries results from a single floor lay-out; the extra labor costs involved in high buildings; high land costs; the more stringent requirements as to buildings, fire protection, etc., demanded in central London positions. High general costs and high rates were also mentioned as reasons generally supporting lack of space in justifying a move, usually to some position further out or less completely built up.

Several manufacturers stated that they would have moved further out if they could have found satisfactory sites. Generally level sites affording firm foundations are desired. The total supply of such areas is not great; and many other requirements limit the effective choice in each case. Some are tied because of the need to be near other industries which they serve or on which they depend for parts or services. Some are dependent on securing existing buildings which can be rented, not having free capital with which to build.

For some trades on the other hand a clear atmosphere free from smoke and dust is important. This applies to many food-preparing factories.

TRANSPORT

For some industries river frontage is necessary to save transshipment into barges. For others access to canal will serve. Some require to keep within the free delivery area from the chief railway companies' depots. For others doing a large parcel trade easy access to several railway termini is important. Suitable delivery areas for

their own vans condition some industries; a distance which will permit two journeys per day may show great economy over one that will only permit a single journey. Where firms are managed by frequent directors' meetings, a distance much greater than 10 miles from London may waste much directors' time.

Transport is clearly one of the most important considerations determining location. While convenience for local delivery may tend to foster central locations, traffic congestion and delays in the centre certainly tend to the choice of sites further out with which communications are less delayed.

There is evidence to suggest that the choice by many industries of sites on the north and west of London in place of riverside sites on the east has been due in no small extent to the time which motor vans or cars must take to get through London from the east before they can get away on their journey to the main home ports or markets, which except for London itself, lie mainly north or west. Better circumferential roads to meet these requirements might prove of great assistance to industry.

MARKETS

Evidently in regard to possible distance out or need to be near London at all circumstances vary greatly. Some industries doing mainly export trade need only to have access to railway and thence to ports; others need good road access to the docks. Others doing a home trade widely distributed may pay too dearly for extra convenience in serving their London customers, if they add to the difficulties in regard to those in the rest of the country. Some trades serve the local needs of London and must be on the spot. Some depend on frequent visits from clients or customers to examine their goods or choose among them; they must be reasonably accessible, though as one manufacturer said customers do not go to the nearest maker but to the one who gives best value. Others make only a standard product or articles which can be sold from samples; they can be largely independent of distance.

LOCATION GENERALLY

In view of the varied conditions it is not surprising that testimony as to location differed widely. While many found no fault with Letchworth 35 miles or Welwyn 21 miles out, there were others who thought 15 miles, and many who thought 10 miles, were about the desirable limits for their purposes. Evidently in many cases they were not

definite limits; their choice was largely influenced by individual difficulties experienced on sites not properly developed; house shortage; absence of amusements; or deficiency of services, mainly due to haphazard development.

Several employers explained their general views as to the location of industry in and around London. One view expressed was that the factories should be in the outer ring, the workers living mainly in the central area and travelling out to work. The contrary view was also put forward; that the factories should be located in or on the outer fringe of the existing town and the workers be housed outside, coming inwards to work. One employer thought that there should be factories on the immediate fringe, then a belt of housing with factories again in a belt beyond. While these views differ widely, they agree in recognising both the inadequacy of the present haphazard development and the importance of securing a proper relation between industrial areas and the districts where the employees live.

It was pointed out, and indeed is evident, that the grouping of industries is no less essential for efficiency of working and services than it appeared to be in regard to good labor supply.

The cost of water, gas and electricity are important factors. It is cheaper to equip an industrial area of considerable size with these and other services than to provide them for factories scattered at random around the fringe of a town.

The same is true as regards transport. An outlay on sidings, canal, or road connections which would be justified to serve an industrial area having many factories would be too great a charge to be borne by any one of them.

Similarly, train facilities, towing provision on river and canal, parcels delivery and other similar services can be greatly increased when they serve a considerable industrial area. The advantage of grouping numbers of industries in one well equipped area holds good whether that area is on the fringe of the town, in a suburb or satellite settlement 10 or 15 miles out, or in a Garden City 20 to 30 miles out.

The varying and sometimes conflicting needs of different industries have been emphasised. The desirability of securing sites appropriate for different classes of production and protecting them from the intrusion of other enterprises harmful to the class has been raised. The importance of co-ordinating the provision of dwellings for the working classes with the location of factories, and many other matters in addition to those mentioned in the Report which will be of great value in

selecting areas for industrial development have been brought to the notice of the Committee.

PART II

PROMOTING CO-ORDINATED DEVELOPMENT

The general conclusion to be drawn from the first part of this Report is that the efficiency of industry and the welfare of the industrial population in Greater London would be most effectually promoted if future development could be co-ordinated in the form of self-contained or satellite units; and that the irregular distribution of factories or small industrial areas and small groups of dwellings scattered over the Region is not economical or otherwise beneficial to industry or to the dwellers in the houses. It becomes important, therefore, to consider how the desired types of co-ordinated development can be promoted.

If means to this end are found to be available, or if they can be made effective by additional powers the granting of which can reasonably be anticipated, the choice and reservation of sites for such units of development will become a most important feature of the Regional Plan.

The character of the development of London depends mainly on the actions of the following parties:

- (a) The public, who occupy and use the buildings and create the demand for them.
- (b) The developers, who lay out the sites and erect the buildings.
- (c) The owners of the ground, who have extensive rights and powers to encourage or retard development and to determine its character.
- (d) The local authorities who have duties and powers in regard to planning and control, the provision of services, housing, etc., which, suitably exercised, may exert great cumulative influence.

To secure the completely co-ordinated development which is desired, all these classes must be induced to co-operate and constrained to confine their activities or influence within the limits which a co-ordinated result allows.

THE PUBLIC

As regards (a) the public who create the demand, the position is favorable. We have seen that there are many industrial undertakings seeking suitable sites. They have need for facilities for efficient industrial development; these include a pool of labor conveniently

accessible. There are also many thousands of people of all classes needing to be housed annually in outer London, sufficient in fact to populate several units. If the satellites can be planned and equipped to meet these needs better than they are met by the present haphazard and sporadic building, the support of the occupying public may be expected. This involves good choice of sites, skilled planning, and security that the units will be equipped and completed according to plan.

As regards (*b*) the developers: If on the one hand their clients the public are satisfied and on the other hand the owners and local authorities afford adequate facilities for the type of development proposed, they can have little objection to follow good plans; for they are likely to be at least as remunerative as bad ones. Their interest is to satisfy the public where and how they desire, so far as the dispositions of the landowners and the regulations of the local authorities will allow. The building developers are the party least affected by the method proposed, except as the public may accept or oppose it.

It depends therefore mainly on the views and actions of the owners and the local authorities whether the policy of co-ordinated development can be made effective.

THE OWNERS

Considering first the owners (*c*): It is clear that those who own the undeveloped land round London have a very strong collective interest to promote a policy of decentralisation as opposed to one of increased central concentration. So far as development in co-ordinated and well-planned units affords the most effective competition to greater central concentration, they have a clear collective interest to support this also. Their individual interests, however, may be very different. The owners of the sites selected for the self-contained units of development would be the ones to secure all the advantage. Those who own the surrounding lands, on which building might be discouraged or prevented, would not only have no share in the benefit but might have their present prospect of securing a share of sporadic building diminished or destroyed. There should be little difficulty in securing the co-operation of the owners of the lands on which it is desired to locate units of development; but owners of lands on which it may be desired to discourage development cannot be expected to look favorably on the policy; unless indeed some plan by which they may share in the advantages can be devised. The difference of interest is an important obstacle to securing general support from owners, even though their collective interest may be clear.

The local authorities (*d*) have duties and powers of planning and controlling development. They also have indirect financial interests dependent on the character of development and its distribution. This is particularly the case if the areas of many authorities are concerned, as in the London Region, where consequently any "gain on the swings" in one area does not make up for "a loss on the roundabouts" in another. While local authorities exist to promote good administration and planning in accordance with the wishes of the people, they cannot ignore the financial interests of the ratepayers in their particular areas. Looked at from this sectional point of view, each authority feels a general interest in the creation of additional rateable value in its area. It has a special inducement to promote those classes of building which give the best return in rates in proportion to the outlay on all the public services which they entail.

To some extent, therefore, the county and local authorities outside the central area in Greater London share with the landowners the common interest in the policy of decentralisation; and the conflicting individual interest of each to secure for its own area the maximum of profitable development. These interests, though similar to those of the owners, are much less clearly defined. Increase in the amount of rateable property shows no general tendency to reduce the rates; rather is the contrary true. The encouragement of development generally by local authorities is therefore not based on the prospect of securing relief from rates. It may, however, be based on securing better value for them; or on indirect benefits to property owners; or on natural civic pride in a growing community. Whatever the causes, desire to encourage development and objection to being included in areas where development is discouraged are factors to be considered.

THE RELATION TO THE RATES

As to the kinds of development which contribute more to the rates than they cost in services, and those which on the contrary cost more than they contribute, the position has been changed by the derating provisions in the Local Government Act, 1929, which have also tended to increase the difficulty of distinguishing the net result. The partial derating of factories has clearly made this class of building less profitable, though it is possible that industrial buildings still contribute rather more than they cost. They can no longer be counted on, however, to make a substantial contribution towards the deficiency on the houses in which the employees dwell. A factory area may consequently not be so attractive a form of development for local authorities as previously. From the point of view of industry rates have become a factor in the choice of sites only 25% as important as for-

merly. The inducement to move from highly rated central areas to lower rated areas outside has to this extent been weakened. The real effect on the interests of county and local authorities cannot be so simply stated. There is now a grant-in-aid from the Exchequer largely based on loss of rateable value due to the change; but this basis diminishes in its influence on the grant at each revision and expires in 15 years. Meantime the grant allocated to county boroughs and to the county area is increasingly based on a population-cum-poverty factor, expressed in terms of rateable value per head, and of unemployment. The purpose of this basis is to distribute the national grant-in-aid more nearly according to need. The direct contribution to Urban and Rural District Councils is a per capita grant based on census population, the per capita rate being the same for all urban areas, and the same (one-fifth of the urban rate) for all rural areas. It will be seen that under the new grant system artisan's housing by adding to the population increases both the grant to the county as a whole and the total of the per capita grant to the local council, which factory buildings as such would not. On the other hand, a high class dwelling will contribute more in rates per family and will add to the per capita grant of the district the same amount as workers' dwellings occupied by the same number of persons. By spreading the incidence of poor law and some other charges over the whole county area, however, the adverse balance on the small dwelling from the rating point of view has been reduced.

The exact financial effect of these changes is not easy to follow and will vary from place to place; but perhaps the general effect may not unfairly be summarised as follows:

(a) As regards industrial buildings: While local authorities outside the central areas will have less inducement to encourage industrial development than formerly, the central authorities will have an equally weakened interest in retaining them; for there they would be likely to be replaced by commercial buildings and probably such change would be highly profitable as regards rating. From the point of view of a policy of decentralization perhaps these interests may be set off one against the other.

(b) As regards the working-class dwellings: The advantage from a rating point of view of securing large houses and commercial buildings rather than small dwellings remains. It is probable, however, that the spreading of some former local charges over county areas, and the placing of the grant from the national exchequer increasingly on a per capita-cum-poverty basis, must reduce though it may not extinguish the actual rating deficiency on small dwellings.

(c) It would seem, none the less, that any development consisting exclusively or to an excessive extent of factories and working-class dwellings might present a difficult proposition from the rating point of view.

If this summary is approximately correct, then it may be said that the changes due to the Local Government Act tend to emphasize the importance of securing a co-ordinated development of self-con-

tained units in which the industrial buildings and working-class dwellings are balanced by the full share of the more profitable larger dwellings, shops, commercial and recreational buildings, which a self-contained unit would include.

The above considerations suggest that the successful development of well-equipped satellite units could best be secured by combining the general planning powers of local authorities and their ability to provide the necessary services, with the ability and interest, inherent in the ownership of the land, to promote development; to determine its character or location, and to prevent discordant or sporadic building taking place within the area owned.

Where the site of the satellite unit is situated wholly within the area of one county and one local authority, the matter as far as they are concerned is greatly simplified. The preparation of a town planning scheme could be undertaken; and this could be made to encourage the result desired. Where the proposed site overlaps the areas of two or more authorities, questions of planning, supply of service, etc., are more complicated; and probably the creation of a Joint or Regional Town Planning Body would be desirable; in this the County Council could co-operate.

Similarly where the site of the proposed unit affects the land of only one owner or is contained in a few large ownerships much may be done by agreement. Where, however, ownerships are numerous, this action would be more difficult; and the purchase of the site with sufficient area surrounding it to afford some protection from the interference and competition of sporadic building, might be the only, as indeed it would generally be the most effective, method of dealing with the problem.

* * * * *

FURTHER TOWN PLANNING POWERS NEEDED

Consideration of the use of town and regional planning for the purpose of securing co-ordinated unit development, reveals the same inadequacy of power that appeared as the chief obstacle when the Committee were considering how to secure an adequate area of open space, and how to maintain a proper relation between areas devoted to building development and those reserved as open land. The further investigations in regard to decentralisation and the use of town planning powers to secure good co-ordinated development, emphatically confirm the importance of the additional powers asked for by the Committee in their first Report; particularly that the power of zoning by means of

town planning schemes may be extended so that areas may be allocated:—

(i) For building development according to the scheme.

(ii) For reservation from building development.

So long as the planning authority does not possess these powers, many of the main purposes for which town planning should be used can only be effected by the purchase of land on a large scale. If such purchase is to be avoided, the local authority must be given greater power to allocate development and to reserve open land on terms fair alike to the public and to the owners.

The experiments carried out by voluntary Associations at Letchworth and Welwyn have successfully established many of the principles and methods of development here found to be desirable. These projects, however, have succeeded under conditions differing in many respects from those prevailing in the less remote parts of the Greater London Region. That these principles may be better understood and their possibilities more thoroughly explored it is most desirable that there should be promoted a few satellite units designed to meet the special needs and circumstances of Greater London. Such examples would test the possibilities under new conditions; would add to the experience of different methods; and would help by example to convince all the parties concerned of the desirability and the practicability of this method of development.

Pending the necessary powers for the adoption of a general development plan for Greater London based on this principle of locating future satellite units, it is suggested that the Government might promote two or three such complete industrial satellite units as part of the programme for finding useful work for the unemployed. The conditions at Slough offer a favourable opportunity if seized at once; and other promising sites can be found.

It is difficult to imagine any more valuable undertaking than the creation of a few examples of such self-contained unit development. They would demonstrate how best new and expanding industries can be provided for, under conditions best calculated to increase their efficiency, and to promote the well-being of all classes occupied in carrying them on, or in ministering to the various needs, economical, educational or cultural of the population.

This would represent work which would not otherwise be undertaken at present, it would make a most valuable contribution to the

solution of problems which press with especial urgency for solution in the London Region; and only with slightly less urgency in the regions round other large towns.

Such undertaking would in all probability be ultimately a sound financial proposition if carried out through a suitable expert business board with the support and co-operation of the Government and of the local authorities in providing the services and other facilities. It is unlikely that anything more than a loan of the capital or guarantee of interest pending development, on the lines of the Trade Facilities Act, would be required, together with such subsidy for the working-class houses as would have to be found wherever they were built.

New methods of co-ordinated planning and development are called for by the changing character of modern industry, the rapid growth of motor transport and other altered conditions. If the advantages of development by self-contained units were effectually demonstrated, the probability of Town and Regional Planning Schemes being used to promote their general adoption would be greatly increased.

IS THE GARDEN CITY MOVEMENT A FAILURE?

“It behooves us to consider how it is that we have worked for 30 years and have only succeeded in that period in accommodating about 24,000 persons in the two Garden Cities of Letchworth and Welwyn, whereas during the last 10 years that number of available persons have settled in the Greater London area every 12 weeks.”—Raymond Unwin.

In this heart-searching fashion Raymond Unwin at a meeting of the Garden City movement held at Welwyn a few months ago thus challenged the attention of the people of England.

On this occasion he pointed out that in the last 10 years, since 1921, a new population had been accommodated in Greater London outside of the London County Council area totaling over 1,000,000 people—equal approximately to a settlement of 2,000 persons a week. He pointed out at the same time that during this period there had moved into the Greater London area from outside the vast number of 390,000 new inhabitants for Greater London. That of this latter number 195,000, or approximately half, appeared to have settled not only outside the County of London but outside the boundary of the Metropolitan Police area, and within that of Greater London—that is, in areas eminently suitable for the development of complete Garden Cities or Satellite Towns. Yet, in spite of this great influx of available population, as

he points out, the only Garden City to be developed within that area was that of Welwyn.

He went on to point out that not only has this immense population been on the move but the records show that there have been a sufficient number of new factories established outside the London County Council area during the last 10 years to represent nearly half a million of people, allowing for the necessary labor, those who serve them and the families usually attached.

Reflecting upon these facts and applying them to the slowness with which the Garden City movement has extended itself in England, Mr. Unwin finds that the chief reason for this failure has been that the movement has not been sufficiently linked to the movement for the expansion of towns—an expansion which has been going forward during the entire time in the natural ordinary way. His solution for the problem is found in the establishment of a number of satellite towns embodying the fundamental principles of the Garden City, a result, which in his opinion, can be achieved through the control to be exercised by the new Town Planning Bill if that Act is once enacted.

ENGLAND'S FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

That others in the Garden City movement have not been unconscious of the slowness with which the idea has spread and the importance of controlling the future development of England along the lines indicated by Mr. Unwin is evidenced by the discussions that have been going on in *Garden Cities and Town Planning*—the journal of that movement.

In an editorial in a recent issue of that journal, William L. Hare, its Editor, has the following comment to make on the situation:

For 32 years our Association has labored for the cause which is expressed in the first part of its name, and not in vain. Two Garden Cities stand as a witness to our work, and as monuments to the memory of Ebenezer Howard. * * *

There may be some who think that our name stands for a task that is finished rather than for one as yet unfulfilled. Two Garden Cities, they say, are founded and have no companions to support them.

Immense development goes on apace all over our country and no third Garden City shows its head above the horizon.

Is there, then, some weakness in our thesis, some failure of energy, some fault in diplomacy by which this fact can be explained?

THE OUTWARD AND VISIBLE SIGN

The answer to these doubts is not difficult to formulate. Letchworth and Welwyn Garden Cities were and are demonstrative experiments in a new method of town structure which had to be tried out

objectively before the thesis could be understood. They were undertaken admittedly by bodies of private persons whose purses were none too full but where heads and hearts were aflame with enthusiasm and public spirit. The task was almost too great and the financial strain was onerous; nevertheless, one part of it has been performed successfully.

There in Hertfordshire stand two beautiful young towns containing between them 150 factories and workshops, 6,600 houses and cottages, 45 miles of roads, 30 public buildings, 20 schools, 27 places of religious worship, 650 acres of open spaces and playing fields, 4,150 acres of agricultural land, and resident populations totalling 23,000 of whom 10,000 work in the towns. The figures are approximate.

It is with good reason, therefore, that Letchworth and Welwyn are without exaggeration "the cynosure of all eyes" from our own islands, from the continent of Europe and beyond. It is not without significance that a hundred little housing schemes have been christened "Garden City", "gartenstad", "cit -jardin", "haveby", "citt -Giardino", "agropolis", and, for aught that we know, have Mongolian equivalents in the Far East.

The Garden City idea has seized the imagination and received the approval of technicians and town-planners in every part of the world; and the fact that as yet Letchworth and Welwyn have no sister cities at home or abroad is a witness to the difficulties which they have faced and the faith with which they have surmounted them. * * *

THE WARP AND WOOF OF TOWN PLANNING

Town - planning, country - planning, regional planning, national-planning are gradually extending fields in which the Garden City principle is and will be adapted. Transport in all its fascinating features is the warp of all this planning, while housing and industrial siting are its woof. The horrid slums and their clearance are our deep concern, and alike the preservation of all that is beautiful and delightful in the aspect of Nature's environment. * * *

The problem is no longer one of repeating the *tours de force* of Letchworth and Welwyn—of building here or there a single Garden City in 25 years—but of finding a new technique suited to the motor age, new financial resources in a period of crisis, and a new harness to political power at the beginning of a new era.

CONSTRUCTIVE STATESMANSHIP

That the advocates of the Garden City movement were fully aware of this situation and had formulated a well defined policy as well as a philosophy of the proper method for the future development of England was made evident two years ago when a delegation waited upon the then Minister of Health and presented to him a Memorandum, the chief recommendation of which was the setting up of a special body in the Government charged with the definite duty of fostering the development of Garden Cities.

The Memorandum submitted at that time embodies so definitely the proposals made by the Association and the steps which in their

opinion should be taken if the Garden City movement is to really count for anything in the future of England that we give it in full:

* * * * *

The Memorandum which was submitted to you prior to our visit contained a general statement of the policy which the Association has pursued for a period of years, resulting in the foundation of two Garden Cities in Hertfordshire. In brief, that policy has sought to influence the physical development of our country in such a way as to lead to a system of Controlled Decentralisation.

I. UNCONTROLLED DECENTRALISATION

Of late, however, owing to the new facilities afforded by rapid transport, many mobile industries have, in fact, moved out of urban centres to rural sites, flanking the main railway lines and arterial roads. Similarly, there has been considerable movement of residence. As you remarked to our deputation, these two kinds of development are creating radial ribbons from the towns and defacing the rural areas. Some of the great municipalities have already established colonies within the areas of neighboring authorities, creating dormitory satellites. In these cases no provision is made for the establishment of industry. They lack the social and civic elements which belong to town life, and are incapable of providing amenities which are of high cultural and economic value.

We agree with you in the criticism which you directed against this uncontrolled development. But we go further and oppose to this new system, as we do to the older form of centralised congestion, our proposal for new townships built in the likeness of Letchworth and Welwyn Garden Cities, where the workers live close to their work.

You were kind enough to ask us to write you further on the difficulties which arise and which we understand to be:

- (a) the nature and functions of the statutory body proposed to be established; and
- (b) the effect of our proposals, if carried out, upon local authorities.

II. THE INADEQUACY OF PRESENT POWERS

Before doing so we may be permitted to point out that there are already in existence certain authorities and powers to which we look to assist our policy, namely, the Ministry of Health with its powers for housing and town-planning; the Ministry of Transport with its road-making powers; the local authorities with their housing and town-planning duties and opportunities; and the Regional Planning Committees which may soon be endowed with statutory powers. Finally, the Public Works Loan Board has power to lend to approved Companies engaged in the development of Garden Cities.

It might seem that here, collectively, is sufficient power to bring into existence as many new towns as are, from time to time, needed to meet the demands of new development.

But there is lacking one power which is essential to the creation of new towns on the Garden City principle; a driving, authoritative and co-ordinating force.

All present bodies are fully occupied with the discharge of their functions. Moreover, the Regional Committees do not yet cover the

whole country. It is not wise we submit to wait until by an uncertain process the various existent bodies combine to do what is desired; nor is it safe to risk their failure so to do.

III. A "SPECIAL BODY"

Paragraph 16 of our Memorandum contains in brief the substance of our present proposals and may be condensed here, viz. that a special body should be set up under the Ministry of Health, or associated with it, charged with the definite duty of fostering development of Garden Cities, located in accordance with regional plans.

IV. PRECEDENTS

For precedents we may point out the several other *ad hoc* authorities lately endowed with exclusive functions: (i) The Development Commission, established by Parliament in 1909, was given the duty "to stimulate the more fruitful development of our natural resources." As soon as it was constituted, it became the duty of the Commission, in association with the Department, to devise and set going a series of constructive services; (ii) the Road Board, established in 1909, now incorporated in the Ministry of Transport; and (iii) the Central Electricity Board; all resemble the type of new body now suggested by us.

V. FUNCTIONS

We do not, then, propose a body like a Royal Commission, that would make recommendations and then dissolve, but a permanent body with functions to stimulate the adoption of the policy outlined in our first Memorandum. This body would depend upon the Regional Planning Committees for technical advice, and would be in constant and direct touch with the local authorities concerned. It would have the power to scrutinise and approve schemes submitted by County Councils or Corporations for the creation of new towns, and would have power to recommend loans from the Treasury. It would also have the duty of fostering the development of new towns, either through the resources of local authorities or authorised associations; but in both cases looking to the Regional Planning Committees for technical advice and organisation.

VI. DIFFICULTIES IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Both before and after the submission of our Memorandum to you we have given prolonged and careful consideration to the difficulties which might arise to local authorities. Should our proposals be adopted we are convinced that no apprehension need be felt in this matter. Recommendations by any Regional Planning Committee or Committees for the creation of new towns might be adopted by a County Council or Corporation, in which case no difficulties, such as you anticipate, would arise from the operations of the proposed statutory body.

Consideration would need to be given to the ways and means by which a large urban authority suffering from congestion could be empowered to acquire suitable land in a neighboring area and there develop a satellite town. The advantage to such an acquiring authority would be obvious, and the authority which relinquishes so much of

its land would be relieved of the responsibility for the provision of public services. Therefore, no clash could occur between the two authorities. It may be, in the process of time, that the new town could be given complete freedom from its parent authority.

Finally, if under the stimulus of the proposed statutory body, an authorised company should undertake the formation of a satellite town as at Letchworth and Welwyn, no complications would arise in connection with local government. The classical illustration of Hertfordshire helps us here. The Rural District Councils found no inconvenience when Letchworth and Welwyn were designed to be built. The Hertfordshire County Council never objected, but approved of the ventures which have brought to it an increased rateable value and protected its amenities.

VII. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEES

The need for such a proposed body is more urgently realised when Regional Planning Committees have made recommendations for the establishment of satellite towns and have even suggested sites within the region which should be so developed, as for instance East Kent, Doncaster, Hertfordshire. The recommendations of Regional Planning Committees remain only such, and the important question arises: Who is to bring these new towns into existence? Under present legislation there remains a gap in local government. That is the question to which we addressed ourselves and which formed the basis of our recent Memorandum to you.

This defect in regional planning organisation has, we believe, already been brought to the notice of the Ministry of Health, not only by several bodies having interest in the matter, but by local authorities themselves. The Reports issued by Regional Planning Committees contain only recommendations, and the carrying into effect of even the minor recommendations depends entirely upon the constituent local authorities; but when major recommendations are concerned local authorities are not always possessed with the resources required. There is felt the need for some statutory body working with the local authorities as represented on the Regional Committees, to provide the necessary resources and to be the driving, authoritative and co-ordinating force with regard thereto.

CECIL HARMSWORTH,
Chairman of the Executive Committee.

ALFRED T. PIKE,
Secretary.

* * * * *

These recommendations were very aptly summed up by Mr. Hare in an editorial some months later in these words:

The guiding instrument has not yet been fashioned. * * * It is an organ of government that shall watch, advise, guide, and control the many disconnected and uncoordinated elements in physical development. Its first formulation is decentralization—by means of the foundation, management and control of future Garden Cities or satellite towns.

THERE MUST BE GROWTH—WHAT KIND SHALL IT BE?

How these results are to be brought about, the difficulties that are involved in the process are very aptly presented in a further editorial of Mr. Hare's published a little over two years ago. On that occasion he said:

We now see the Garden City to be no longer a reformer's dream but a stern necessity to the future of our country. We must have *new towns*, physically; they must be *satellites* of the great towns, economically; they may possibly be *daughter towns* of the great municipal corporations, administratively, or fostered by the State. It is still possible that they may be developed by companies. But whatever their name or legal status they must be technically *planned* as industrial nuclei of great regions in which they are placed. Their purpose first and last must be to participate in the inevitable process of Decentralization which has already begun in the familiar evil forms—ribbons of factories and acres of bungalows. Decentralization in the immediate future should be affected by the construction of new towns as satellites to the great agglomerations. A new science is called for.

PRECEDENTS

As already hinted, the potential developers of Garden Cities in the empty shires are (1) owners of large estates, (2) groups of industrialists, (3) public utility companies, (4) regional committees, (5) county councils, (6) large municipal corporations, or even the State itself. There are precedents for all these methods. Great landlords of the eighteenth century developed large urban estates on their own capital, the Levers built Port Sunlight and the Cadbury's Bournville, Garden City Companies created Letchworth and Welwyn, the L. C. C. has made several dormitory towns, Manchester is making Wythenshawe and the State laid out Gretna.

Here we have precedents enough for what can be done on *better* lines in these green shires. The difficulties are great but not insuperable and necessity presses us to the attempt. If once assent can be given to the *Idea* in the grand manner, the obstacles can be overcome. Satellite towns can be built round London, Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Newcastle, Glasgow, and Edinburgh. The science is known, the technique at hand, the professional skill available. But there seems to be lacking the will and, as some think, the money.

FINANCE

We therefore devote our closing word to the question of finance. Believing the idea to be for the public advantage, the greater part of the capital for such ventures should be drawn from the public purse; that is to say, such towns should be built on *public credit*. The experience of Letchworth and Welwyn shows that rapid development is not possible on insufficient funds raised casually in the market. Yet rapid development is essential for industrial and financial reasons and is to the public advantage.

It is understood that the period between the making of the initial loan and the earning of an income—known as the "lag"—must be one

of 10 or 15 years. Only strong corporations can sustain such efforts as we are now demanding. Interest should be added to the debt until the values created have matured to enable the whole to be paid. It will be good estate management to borrow £500,000 to develop rapidly without harassment and to pay £1,000,000 at the end of the period.

If during the next 20 years we build 20 Garden Cities in the shires round London, England would have after long travail discovered the industrial, economic, hygienic and moral value of the Garden City Idea.

A GOVERNMENT INQUIRY ON GARDEN CITIES

The mills of God not only grind exceeding small but take a long time in the process. It was 18 months later that the Government moved in the direction indicated, the Minister of Health and the Secretary of State for Scotland jointly appointing a committee "to examine the experience already gained in regard to the establishment of Garden Cities and Villages and Satellite Towns." In the Terms of Reference appointing this committee, the Committee was instructed to make recommendations as follows:

1. The steps, if any, which should be taken by the Government or local authorities to extend the provision of such Garden Cities and Villages and Satellite Towns.
2. In particular how the location of industries in them can be stimulated.
3. The questions of finance and local government connected with their establishment.
4. And what further measures, if any, can and should be taken for securing in the extension of existing towns that industrial, residential, and other development are properly correlated.

Lord Marley, D.S.C., was appointed Chairman of the Committee and its other members included Dr. Raymond Unwin, President Royal Institute of British Architects, Sir Theodore Chambers, and the following persons:

R. Bell, C.B.E.; J. C. Burleigh; Sir Ernest Clark, K.C.B., C.B.E.; Alderman Rose Davies, J.P.; J. Chester Ede, M.P.; C. Gerald Eve, F.S.I.; T. Peirson Frank, M.Inst.C.E.; Alderman W. T. Jackson, J.P.; J. Norval; P. J. Pybus, C.B.E., M.P.; Sir William Whyte, O.B.E. The Secretary to the Committee was H. A. Montmorency, O.B.E., of the Ministry of Health.

Shortly after appointing the Committee the existing Government went out of office and a new Government came into power.

In a somewhat plaintive letter to the *London Times* last December, the Committee's Chairman, Lord Marley, states that "the Committee has never met and now appears to have faded away." In it he expresses the hope that the present Minister of Health will have his attention again drawn to the importance of the matter to the end that he may authorize the existing Committee to proceed with the inquiry or appoint a new Committee for the purpose, pointing out that the Com-

mittee is likely to have especial importance in view of the proposal to establish foreign factories in England following the new governmental policy of Protection and the abandonment of the country's traditional Free Trade policy.

So far as we can learn nothing further has been done in the matter.

THE GOVERNMENT'S GREAT OPPORTUNITY

We believe the proposal made by the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association that a special government body to develop and foster the growth of Garden Cities and Satellite Towns is an eminently sound one and that only through such a medium can progress in this direction be expected.

It is to be hoped, however, that the new National Government will rise to the occasion and see the great opportunity that awaits it in the appointment of a committee to deal with this question in intelligent and progressive fashion. The opportunity is great. The whole future welfare of England is really involved.

The fact that Neville Chamberlain, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer and a dominant figure in the new Government, is so deeply interested in slum clearance, in housing and in town planning augurs well for the new Government's taking up this proposal.

WELWYN MAY COME INTO ITS OWN

In the necessity imposed upon foreign manufacturers of establishing new branch factories in England if they are to hold their English markets under the new Protective Tariff of that country, it would seem as if there were likelihood that Welwyn and Letchworth might come into their own industrially and that many new factories might be established in these two Garden Cities. To this end Welwyn has recently issued a delightful brochure entitled "Factories in England—A Welwyn Book" in which in 30 pages very attractively printed and illustrated the advantages of settling in Welwyn are held out to the foreign manufacturer who is contemplating moving his factory to England—in fact to all manufacturers British as well as foreigners.

The pamphlet deals with factories in England and discusses their location, design, construction, equipment and the cognate questions of transport, labor, welfare and housing. It is rather startling to find

featured on a frontispiece map the statement that over half the population of England and Wales, viz., 20,000,000 people, now live within 100 miles of Welwyn. It is also strikingly significant to find on this same map the statement that in the decade that has recently passed, from 1921 to 1931, 615,000 people have moved to Southeast England from the North Midlands and the West.

We commend to all students of Town Planning and Housing in the United States this extremely interesting and valuable brochure. Copies can be obtained upon application to Welwyn Garden City Ltd., Estate Office, Welwyn Garden City, Herts, England.

WELWYN AND LETCHWORTH

That the Garden City movement has been a success in England so far as it has had opportunity to demonstrate itself in the two outstanding examples at Welwyn and Letchworth is constantly being made evident. Housing reformers and town planners in the United States and in other countries who have constantly before them the object lesson of these two garden developments will find most valuable supporting evidence as to the success of this movement in *Garden Cities and Town Planning* of January 1930 which is practically a number devoted to Welwyn Garden City.

Our readers will find in that issue articles on all the various aspects of the subject—its houses and its health; its industries; its engineering problems; its social life; its horticulture; its commerce; its domestic economy; its education; its local government. These articles include among others:

Welwyn Garden City as a Place to Live In; Engineering Developments at Welwyn Garden City—Roads and Bridges; Pioneering in Local Government at Welwyn; The Industrial Development of Welwyn Garden City; Shops at Welwyn Garden City; The Health of Welwyn Garden City; Education in Welwyn Garden City; Gardening in Welwyn Garden City; The Financial Aspects.

LETCHWORTH TOO DEVELOPING

While Welwyn has thus been advancing, its parent Letchworth has been holding its own and similarly progressing. During February 5 new factories have been contracted for in Letchworth. A German firm of locksmiths has taken one of the factories now in course of construction by the Company, and has already delivered 300 tons of machinery for its plant. Another German firm of makers of heavy excavating machinery has signed a lease for a site on which a factory is now being built.

Two Dutch firms have also selected Letchworth—one in the printing industry and the other for the manufacture of photographic paper.

Letchworth continues to be favored by manufacturers of pure food, a London firm of makers of infant foods having recently taken a factory for the production of dried milk.

In addition, one of the larger factories comprising 50,000 square feet in space has been taken by a British firm for the manufacture of screw pressure fans.

With the increasing need of establishing new factories in England, it is obvious that foreigners will continue to locate their British plants under the most advantageous conditions they can find, and it will be strange that if many intelligent manufacturers outside of England do not come soon to realize the very great advantages that will accrue to them from establishing their plants in such Garden Cities.

Interesting facts have been presented recently to show the continued marvelous advantages from the health point of view that Letchworth possesses over the rest of England.

These figures are official, taken from the Annual Report of the Medical Officer of Health of the district, and show that the death rate in Letchworth is 6.7 as compared with a death rate of 11.4 for all of England and Wales, and a death rate of 10.2 for the County of Hertford, a district which is mainly agricultural. This is a remarkable showing. That a community like Letchworth, which is both residential and industrial, should have so splendid a record as contrasted with a purely agricultural district in the same locality and embracing a wider area is extraordinary.

It may be of interest to note that the area of the County of Hertford is 404,520 acres on which there is a population of 401,150 or a density of 0.99 per acre; while the area of the Urban District of Letchworth is 3,651 acres on which dwell a population of 14,454, with a density of 3.96 per acre.

Discussing Garden Cities and the misuse of the term some months ago, *Garden Cities and Town Planning* presented some extremely interesting facts with regard to the distribution of the area of 3 Garden communities—Letchworth, Welwyn and Bournville—giving the relative number of parts per 1,000 parts as the norm used, for houses, for gardens, for factory sites, for shop and other sites, for open spaces, for roads.

These facts, we feel sure, will have so much interest for our readers that we give them here:

	LEITCHWORTH per 1000 parts	WELWYN per 1000 parts	BOURNVILLE per 1000 parts
Houses	50	50	66
Gardens	431	470	648
Factory sites.....	110	55	66
Shop and other sites.....	36	15
Open spaces.....	249	320	100
Roads	124	90	120
	<hr/> 1,000	<hr/> 1,000	<hr/> 1,000

ENGLAND'S NEWEST GARDEN COMMUNITY

WYTHENSHAWE—MANCHESTER

What promises to be England's third "Garden City" is to be found in the new satellite town of Wythenshawe now being developed on the outskirts of Manchester.

Although not in the strict sense of the term in every respect able to qualify as a Garden City, as that term has been defined by the advocates of the Garden City idea in England, it probably more nearly approaches the Garden City ideals than any other community thus far planned in any country—always excepting Letchworth and Welwyn.

The land is owned by the City of Manchester which is thus able to exercise a unified control over its development and use. In this respect it is considered to be an advance upon the methods employed at Letchworth and Welwyn where there is divided control between a private corporation and the public authority.

Wythenshawe seems to us to embody most of the principles of the Garden City idea. It is primarily a residential community with the number of houses—and, therefore, the number of people—definitely limited; every house is developed with a garden; there are agricultural belts surrounding it serving as separating barriers from unwise developments; there are ample open spaces for recreation and other amenities; there are public buildings and shops and business premises, industries, agricultural buildings—in a word, a complete community.

We are not informed as to what led the authorities of the City of Manchester to decide to embark upon this undertaking and to develop it along these lines, but we are inclined to suspect that the drastic criticisms of the city's housing work made two years ago by Professor C. H. Reilly, an eminent English architect, got under the skin of the Manchester authorities and led them to look at the future development of their community from a slightly different angle.

AN ARCHITECT'S CRITICISM

Nearly two years ago Professor Reilly, at the request of the *Manchester Guardian*, England's famous newspaper, drove rapidly through a number of the Manchester housing estates and then wrote up his impressions for that journal. There were no reticences about his criticisms. He spoke his mind in true British fashion and told the public authorities in Manchester just how horrible he thought most of their housing work in the past had been. He said among other things on that occasion:

It was a depressing experience. It is a very sad thing; for, money has been spent freely but not thought and feeling; and money without thought and feeling will not produce architecture.

After discussing the apparently somewhat bastard Gothic and Georgian architecture that he saw, Professor Reilly went on to point out:

If Manchester was going in for mass production of houses—as was her duty after the war—it was surely her duty, too, to see that the unit to be repeated was as perfect as possible. That is the one advantage mass production can bring about. Yet it has been thrown away. Manchester ought, I suggest, to have paid a high price to Sir Edwin Lutyens or to its own Dr. Percy Worthington to have designed as nearly perfect a pair of houses as possible, detailed with real care and feeling within and without, before setting about her production of it many thousand times. A good simple thing of fine proportions is the only thing which will stand reproduction in this unlimited way.

Alternatively, and I think better, she should have employed her own young trained architects at an agreed fee and have given each of them an estate to lay out and develop. In this way she would have secured character in the work and probably an individuality to each estate. At present after seeing the first three or four estates one feels one has seen them all. The same bad little pairs of houses are peppered about everywhere in the same dull way. There is no sense of focus anywhere or of community life—no grouping of similar houses round some centre as one gets in a real village. Even if one had had merely one estate of little concrete houses in one place, another of tiled-roofed cottages in another, and of Georgian ones in a third, and each group had had some definite centre in the village green, church, hall, or group of shops some definite interest would have been created.

It is not that a corporation with an official architect cannot build with interest and even with charm. Manchester herself, I notice, in a small tramway offices I passed at Levenshulme and in a library at Withington can do the same when she wants to. My feeling is that in housing she does not care. Anything seems to do.

That was two years ago. Much water has gone over the dam since then. The gift of Wythenshawe Park and Mansion to the City by Sir Ernest and Lady Simon seems to have stimulated the local authorities

to see whether they could not plan and develop a new community that not only would be worthy of Manchester but would take high rank with the best in England.

And in order that there might be no more such criticisms as Professor Reilly had made of their earlier work, they very wisely employed Barry Parker, the eminent architect and one of the designers of Letchworth and one of England's most distinguished town planners, to act as their technical adviser.

A NEW TOWN FOR 100,000 PEOPLE

While it is too much to believe that any corporation has given its technical adviser an entirely free hand—and we have not had the opportunity of consulting Mr. Parker as to the extent of the freedom he may have enjoyed—it is evident from the plans of the Wythenshawe Estate, that if Mr. Parker has not had a free hand, at least he has come as near to that happy state as happens to architects and town planners in this wicked world.

What a delightful opportunity for a town planner to have the chance of developing a tract of 5,566 acres surrounding a beautiful park already in existence and including 3 townships! On this land will be built ultimately 25,000 houses, public buildings, shops, business premises, industrial buildings, agricultural buildings. There will be not only the existing vast park but there will be new agricultural belts, parkways, recreation grounds and other open spaces—everything that goes to make up an ideal community for 100,000 people.

Every intelligent idea in town development that has proven itself in the experience of both England and America, as well as other countries is being utilized. A complete zoning scheme has been already established. In some parts of the Estate the dwellings will be limited to 4 to the acre, in others to 6 to the acre, in others to 8, in others to 10, in others to 12, which seems to be the maximum density in the Estate.

One of the principal features of the Estate is the Parkway running southward from the "gateway" of Wythenshawe through the whole Estate. This runs according to no rigid engineering straight line, we are glad to say, but meanders delightfully in irregular fashion with gently curving roads, yet sufficiently direct to accomplish its purpose—which seems to be not merely that of a "parkway" as we know it in the United States, but an "express highway" treated as a parkway.

This Parkway has been developed along most modern lines, utilizing the experience of the Bronx River Parkway and the Westchester County Park System in America, the treatment of avoiding grade

crossings at cross roads that is in vogue in Radburn, and some of the more recent developments in highway intersection treatment that are to be found in different parts of the United States by which grade crossings are avoided and the turning in of traffic according to a "steady-flow" system is followed.

THE HIGHWAY OF THE FUTURE

Our readers, we feel sure, will be much interested in a discussion of the Highway of the Future by Barry Parker, F. R. I. B. A., past President of the Town Planning Institute of England and the person responsible for the technical development of the Estate. On the occasion a few months ago of a visit to Wythenshawe by a group of English town planners and advocates of Garden Cities, Mr. Parker explained the principal features of the Wythenshawe plan. In speaking of the Parkway, he said:

In order to understand it we must first attempt to visualize what the road of the future must be. I will call this road a parkway. Now, some people seem to think that the main characteristic of such a road is that it should lie in a strip of park and should give its users the feeling that they are passing through a park. Really this characteristic of a parkway results from the consideration of the many practical requirements which a road must fulfil and not from the desire to create aesthetic qualities. What these requirements are I will endeavor to show.

BUILDINGS ON MAIN THOROUGHFARES

Since the War we have spent enormous sums of public money on the creation of roads. On the frontages of these roads we have allowed people to erect buildings approached from them, with the result that each 4-track road has come to have only the efficiency of a 2-track road and each 3-track road has come to have only the efficiency of a 1-track road, because 2 tracks on each are occupied by stopping and standing vehicles in front of the buildings.

Moreover, by allowing buildings on the frontages of these roads to be approached from them, we have rendered them dangerous through vehicles coming out on to them from those buildings and turning out of them into approaches to those buildings. So the 2-track main road of the future must have the efficiency of the 4-track road of today, created by the absence from it of all standing, stopping and turning vehicles.

Then the money which has hitherto been spent on the 2 additional tracks in the main road can be spent on subsidiary roads provided to afford access to the buildings which face the main road, and the efficiency of the main road will be still further enormously enhanced by the greatly increased speed at which traffic can move on it—and move in safety.

On it a motorist must be able to travel swiftly knowing no vehicle will come out of or turn into abutting roads or buildings, and that there

are road junctions and crossings only at very infrequent intervals, and that these will be clearly indicated to him, and, moreover, he must know that he will be compelled by the forms given to these crossings to slacken speed on approaching them.

AVOIDING ROAD CROSSINGS

We now realise that the way to make road crossings safe is to so plan them that there is no crossing of routes of vehicles at them. We now arrange that instead of crossing one another, vehicles shall everywhere first join the stream of other vehicles which is moving in the same direction as they are moving and then turn out of that stream into the road they wish to take. This principle is being accepted everywhere, with it being coupled another principle, namely, that all vehicles must be compelled by the form given to every important road crossing to take it more slowly than they may legitimately travel elsewhere than at a crossing.

Where two roads of equal traffic importance cross, drivers on each road must be compelled to slow down equally. At the crossing of a road of major traffic importance by a road of less traffic importance, the driver of a vehicle on the less important road should be delayed somewhat more than is the driver of a vehicle on the more important road. Where a road of quite minor traffic importance crosses a road of major traffic importance the driver of a vehicle on the minor road should be subjected to a quite considerably greater delay than is the driver on the major road.

“ISLANDS” TO DIVIDE TRAFFIC

All this is accomplished by placing in road crossings, islands of shapes varied to meet the differing conditions—as to traffic importance of roads, as to angles at which roads intersect, as to topography, and as to everything else—and is accomplished by also placing subsidiary islands round these centre islands. These subsidiary islands divide the traffic into one-way streams before it reaches the centre island. They are absolutely essential to success; and on or near each of them a “Keep Left”^{*} sign must be placed.

It is before all else vital that the centre islands in these crossings should be amply large enough to fulfil their purpose, and also that the subsidiary islands should be long enough to fulfil theirs. If the centre islands are too small, the traffic flowing round them is not formed into a stream which is sufficiently long to allow traffic which is joining it to join it tangentially. In other words, the traffic converging on the circulating traffic will converge on it too nearly at right angles. Also the routes vehicles have to take come to be too sharply curved.

A fact of peculiar interest is that the slowing down of traffic at crossings in a road does not entail any loss of efficiency in that road, but the same number of vehicles will pass over a crossing in an hour as would have passed over it if not slowed down; whereas the loss of efficiency in a road caused by stopping the traffic on it to allow traffic to cross it is great.

The great difference between the form of road crossing we are considering and any other form of road crossing is that the flow of

^{*} *In England traffic keeps to the left, not to the right.—Editor.*

vehicles over it is continuous and uninterrupted in every direction and at all times. No vehicle has ever to stop and restart.

POLICE CONTROL UNNECESSARY

It also removes the necessity for police control. When we consider the enormous cost of police control of road crossings in the rest of the city of Manchester, the saving effected by the introduction of crossings of the proposed type in the Wythenshawe Ward will be appreciated.

I began what I had to say about parkways by pointing out that they are not primarily proposed because of their beauty but are principally put forward as solutions of practical problems. Being freed from standing, stopping and turning vehicles and from dangers created by vehicles coming out on to them, they become speedways, allowing motors to get in and out of towns rapidly. So the traffic on the carriageways in them will move very rapidly.

FOOTPATHS SHOULD BE REMOTE

This being so, footpaths must be far removed from these carriageways. Pedestrians could not use footpaths placed close alongside these carriageways for fast-moving motor traffic. Neither is the safety of the fast moving traffic nor the speed which it is desirable that traffic should attain possible under a liability to have pedestrians suddenly stepping out on to the carriageway from a pathway. A further requirement for safety and speed is the long "sight-lines" and the wide unobstructed views afforded to motorists by the "parking" strips on each side of the carriageway. So come into existence the wide, planted and grassed strips in these parkways which make them so attractive and beautiful.

NEIGHBORHOOD UNITS

Not only is this new development to have a modern Express Highway and Parkway combined but it is also to be developed on the principle of the "Neighborhood Unit" which is finding such favor at the present time in the United States.

The industrial zones—from which factories that emit smoke or fumes or unpleasant odors or produce dust will be excluded—are intended to secure the decentralization of those industries of Manchester that may be appropriately located in the new environment without detriment to it. Five per cent (5%) of the entire area has been zoned for industry, using electricity for power.

In addition to the existing park presented by Sir Ernest and Lady Simon to the people of Manchester, two other parks have been reserved as open spaces and a business centre and 8 shopping areas have been set aside in appropriate locations. There is also provision for a golf course of 113 acres, while agricultural belts will surround the whole area.

In making his plan Mr. Parker worked in close co-operation with the municipal authorities of Manchester. Before determining the site for necessary schools he consulted closely with the Education Committee of the Corporation; similarly with regard to hospital sites the Public Health Committee was actively consulted, 200 acres having been reserved as a centre for hospitals and similar institutions, the plan being to transfer some of the hospitals in Manchester to the more healthy surrounding of Wythenshawe.

With these ambitious plans, developed only after the most careful study, and after consideration of the successful experience of other communities, and under the best expert advice, it is not surprising that when the Minister of Health a few months ago announced his change of policy with regard to the type of house for which in future Government subsidies would be available, that cries of anguish rent the air at Manchester. Having completed the plans for the development of this great Estate and determined the types of houses of various kinds that would appropriately find their location there, it was to say the least "unsettling" to be suddenly told by a superior governmental authority that such houses could not be built from that time on.

We are glad to be able to announce that the local authorities and the Ministry of Health have to some extent composed their differences with regard to Wythenshawe. It is reported that the Ministry of Health has agreed to sanction the building there of 316 houses, of which 254 are to be of the 3-bedroom non-parlor type with the bathroom downstairs, 32 of the 1- and 2-bedroom non-parlor type, and 30 of the parlor type. This is but an initial installment, the local authorities having decided to proceed immediately with the erection of those houses that would not involve any appreciable alteration of the original layout.

From all of which it is quite evident that American town planning and housing visitors to England will have a new place of pilgrimage in future. In addition to revisiting Letchworth and Welwyn, they will find much to see and study at Wythenshawe.

THE 30,000TH MUNICIPAL HOUSE

BIRMINGHAM—ENGLAND

When Americans speak of Manchester they also as a rule unconsciously think of Birmingham. For these two great English cities are associated together in the mind of the average American as being very similar communities in their industrial and economic makeup, as well as in their general character and location.

Birmingham whose population today is in round figures 1,000,000 people, covering an area of 46,687 acres has been feeling its growing pains along with other industrial communities in England, and since the War has embarked upon a wholesale plan of house building for its inhabitants. About two years ago, it celebrated the opening of its 30,000th municipal house on one of its most recent Estates, that at Kingstanding in the Perry Barr district almost on the extreme northern boundary of the city's limits adjoining the neighboring town of Sutton Coldfield.

The local authorities in Birmingham celebrated this occasion by the publication of an elaborate brochure dealing with its housing work, entitled "The 30,000th Municipal House." All students of housing and town planning will find it advantageous to obtain a copy of this most interesting document, a printed pamphlet of 60 pages, very fully illustrated with photographs, site plans and house plans and supplied with interesting statistical data describing each of the principal more recent Estates.

We notice that most of these Estates seem to have been developed along the whole eastern boundary of the city, starting at the extreme North with the Kettlehouse Estate and extending in an almost unbroken curving line along the eastern boundary to the southernmost boundary of the city, with a scattering few in the western part of its territory.

The site plans that have been developed in the more recent developments are well worth careful study by all American practitioners, representing many interesting and ingenious ideas and affording a great deal of variety and novelty in the city's development.

We would particularly commend to the study of our readers, the site plans that have been put into practice at the following Estates, Kingstanding (Perry Barr), Kettlehouse Farm (Perry Barr), Witton Lodge Farm Estate, Pype Hayes Estate, Batchelor's Farm and Norton Boys' Home, Marlborough House and Fast Pits Farm (Yardley), and Allens Cross Farm Estate.

It is well worth a trip to Birmingham to study these site developments which have been so successfully worked out by Herbert H. Humphries, City Engineer and Surveyor and executive officer for the city housing schemes in Birmingham.

We feel sure that Mr. Humphries will be glad to send a copy of this interesting brochure to all Americans who may be interested in studying the work at Birmingham in closer detail.

GOVERNMENT HOUSING THAT IS A DELIGHT

NOTTINGHAM—ENGLAND

Even the most hard-boiled opponent of government housing were he to encounter the delightful houses that have been built by the local authorities under government and local subsidy at Nottingham, England, in the 10 years that have elapsed since the War would immediately become an ardent advocate of government housing—that is, if he could put his mind to sleep.

After viewing these delightful houses built with skill and in good architectural taste, according to the very best canons of architecture and town planning, one is inclined to paraphrase Shylock and say, "Almost thou persuadest me to be an advocate of government housing."

In an introduction to a 120-page book entitled "Nottingham Housing Schemes 1919-1928," describing the housing work in Nottingham written by the architect T. Cecil Howitt, D.S.O., A.R.I.B.A., Raymond Unwin very rightly characterizes this work as "an interesting record of the efforts steadily continued through nearly 10 years by the City of Nottingham to solve the housing problem, and a stimulating description of the methods adopted and the character of the homes created under the guidance of the author." He adds:

The city which gave the opportunity and the architect who made such good use of it are alike to be congratulated on the result of their collaboration.

A view with which we heartily concur.

What Mr. Unwin has to say about the intelligent work that has been done in Nottingham always in the best of taste affords an example to those communities where uninteresting "Council 'ouses" do not add to the landscape but rather detract from its beauty. After pointing out that the one and only solution of the post-war housing shortage was to build plenty of *good* houses Mr. Unwin said:

This amply illustrated record adds one more emphatic proof to the many which experience of post-war housing schemes supplies, that there

is no economy in careless planning or in ugly design; that both are merely signs of incompetence, and as such are without valid excuse. The book confirms technical opinion that the way to secure good value from the building industry is to pursue a steady and continuous building programme under the guidance of a skilled architect. With such a programme good houses conveniently planned and pleasingly designed will be secured at less average cost than bad ones produced in any other way; and they will remain a satisfaction and a credit throughout their long life. * * *

Great things have indeed been accomplished throughout the country; a notable contribution is here described; it should serve as a helpful example and an encouragement to go forward with the work until completion is reached. * * * Housing work has a specially human character; the designer is creating in each dwelling the shell which for generations will affect the life of the families occupying it. The choice of the site, the laying out of the ground, the disposition of the roads, open spaces and houses upon it, will all affect the health and the happiness of the tenants.

In the planning of the houses, their design and grouping, there is even more intimate contact and direct influence on the comfort and pleasure of the occupants. The plans and pictures in this volume show how much can be done by the steady and consistent exercise of careful thought and skilled imagination; how great is the difference between the good house which may thus be produced and the bad one which results when this care and skill are absent; and how little is the cost in anything except care and thought needed to secure the good instead of the bad! It is to be hoped that the publication of this record will help many others to earn the satisfaction which the creation of so many good houses must afford to all who have played their part in the work.

As in so many of the recent housing developments in England, there is much to be learned by American town planners and housing practitioners in the various practical illustrations that are thus afforded of intelligent treatment of the site. The site plans that have been developed in many of these schemes are of great interest and possess much originality. Among them may be mentioned the Lenton Abbey Estate; the Stockhill Lane Estate; the Gordon Road Estate; the Wollaton Park Estate; the Bulwell Hall Estate; the Sherwood Estate.

Not only are these site plans of unusual interest, but the houses that have been developed are architecturally some of the best that have been built in England by the local authorities. Both are well worth a visit by American town planning and housing practitioners when they are next in England.

The Sherwood Estate is so attractive that we believe that if Robin Hood, Maid Marian, Alan-a-Dale, Little John, Will Scarlet and all their band were to revisit these glimpses of the moon, they would forsake their leafy dells in Sherwood forest and ensconce themselves in these delightful cottages.

THE PRESERVATION OF LONDON'S SQUARES*

The Royal Commission on London Squares issued a Report in September 1928 which contained references to 456 enclosures. The Commission divided this number into two groups, holding that the owners of 233, covering 223 acres, should be restricted from building on the Garden Squares and should receive no compensation in respect of this restriction, while the owners of 223 enclosures, covering 117 acres, should be equally restricted from building on the Gardens, but should be entitled to submit claims for compensation if they thought fit to do so.

The Bill was promoted by the London County Council and followed closely on the recommendations of the Royal Commission, but in course of discussion in Parliament fresh categories were proposed.

Before giving particulars of the final decision with regard to these Garden Squares it may be well to say for American readers that a very large number of the spaces referred to—probably the majority—are what are called Squares; that is to say, four terraces of houses, or sometimes three, surround a garden that is common to them all. In very few cases do the houses have gardens of their own at the back, being provided with small yards and outhouses. Where the houses are still of a residential character, the inhabitants are entitled to use the garden in the centre of the square; and many do so, though not to the extent that might be expected.

Many of these Squares date from the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—and some few of them earlier still—and any visitor who knows London will appreciate the aim of the London County Council in desiring to preserve them from being used for building purposes.

The provisions of the Act may now be summarised as follows:

206 enclosures (197.25 acres) are preserved without claim to compensation.

41 squares (45.36 acres) are preserved, claim for compensation being waived.

16 squares (18.84 acres) are in the hands of local authorities and Inns of Court and are preserved so long as they remain in their present possession.

21 squares (19.91 acres) are Crown property and are likewise preserved so long as they remain the property of the Crown.

130 squares (78.65 acres) must not be built upon but compensation may be claimed.

* See *Housing*, September, 1928, pp. 185-190.

The Squares and Gardens that are excluded from the Act and may be lost in time are

15	in the Borough of	Kensington
11	" " " "	Paddington
2	" " City	Westminster
7	" " Borough	Chelsea and
2	"	Stepney.

Charterhouse Square, Bridgewater Square, Finsbury Circus and West Smithfield, in the City of London, are preserved so long as they remain in their present ownership.

The London Midland and Scottish Railway has power over 5 enclosures in St. Pancras, including Euston Square, which lies to the South of Euston Terminus, and the Company has power to use them for railway purposes "other than the purpose of a dwelling-house". Of these, Euston Square is the most important and in time we may see development of the railway station a little further South of its present site.

There are a few matters of less importance which may be mentioned. Some of the owners have secured permission through the Act to have underground garages beneath the garden enclosures but there is little likelihood that these will be used extensively.

Street widening will be allowed where re-planning is necessary. An owner who desires to sell a protected square may under certain conditions exchange it for other land. The conditions for obtaining compensation appear to be very reasonable, and, of course, in last resort any difference of opinion would be brought before the courts for arbitration.

Very great satisfaction is felt by the people of London and the local authorities that this matter after remaining in doubt for many years has at last been settled. It is not safe to predict exactly what will happen to these open spaces in reference to their ultimate ownership. Those that stand within residential areas will probably remain as they are, while, as certain squares become commercialised, it is likely that they will be purchased by the local authority and thrown open under certain conditions to the public.

WILLIAM L. HARE
London

HOW TO TELL A TOWN PLANNER FROM A CITY PLANNER

It may not be always easy to define with meticulous accuracy the difference between town planning as that term is understood and used in England, and city planning the equivalent term that is in use in the United States. But there is now one infallible method of distinguishing a British town planner from an American city planner and that is whether or not he has been over the hurdles which the British Town Planning Institute puts up for candidates for admission to the inner circles of the town planning movement in that country.

Over there before a young town planner can become a member of the Town Planning Institute he must pass an examination. In America, we just "look 'em over", get letters of endorsement from the men they have worked with and think on the whole that they will make pretty good members of the Institute and vote them in, unless there is some serious objection to them. No such easy going method is in vogue among our cousins across the water.

This very great difference between the practice among town planners in the two countries has been recently borne in upon us afresh by the receipt of a most important publication on town planning, which the British Town Planning Institute have constituted their "Examination Brochure", containing Papers on many subjects that have been read before the Institute and elsewhere, and which has been prepared for the use of candidates in town planning examinations.

In other words, no matter how vast the experience of a young town planner may be in England, if he wishes to be admitted to the British Town Planning Institute he must be prepared to pass an examination and to know all about the subjects at least that are discussed in this very interesting book of 107 pages which it will be found is not only a very valuable thing for the younger town planners seeking admission to the British Town Planning Institute but for all students of town planning in any part of the world—and certainly for those under English speaking institutions.

How valuable this book is is indicated by the titles of the subjects discussed in it and the names of the persons discussing them. They include among others the following:

The Planning of Mediaeval Cities by F. C. Mears; Road Surface Design by George L. Pepler; Engineering Aspects of Garden City Development by W. E. James; Water Supply as a Factor in Town and Regional Planning by George L. Pepler; Town Planning with Reference to Factory Development and the Distribution of Goods by W. H. Gaunt; The Placing, Design and Arrangement of Railway Terminals by J. Crossland; The Establishment of Municipal Airports in Great

Britain by R. H. S. Mealing; Economy in Estate Development by Barry Parker; The Art and Craft of Landscape Architecture and its Relation to Town Planning by T. H. Mawson; Monumental Memorials and Town Planning by S. D. Adshead; Horizontality and Verticality in the Architectural Treatment of Town Planning Schemes by Barry Parker; Town Planning, City Planning, Urbanisme and Stadtebau by G. Montagu Harris.

All American town planning practitioners will certainly find it advantageous to obtain a copy of this interesting and valuable book. It is very fully illustrated and may be purchased for 3s. 6d. from the Town Planning Institute, No. 11 Arundel Street, London, W. C. 2.

A RECORD OF ACHIEVEMENT

THE NATIONAL HOUSING AND TOWN PLANNING COUNCIL OF ENGLAND

One of the important factors in the steady and continuing development of better housing in England is the activities of a private organization, The National Housing and Town Planning Council, which in its fundamental purposes might be described as the English equivalent of the National Housing Association in America, but with more adequate revenues and a wider constituency.

This private organization, supported by voluntary contributions but having its members made up very largely of representatives of the local authorities in England, has recently published its 32nd Annual Report.

This document is an inspiring record of achievement and one which housing workers in America will do well to study.

As is to be expected in the accounting of an active propagandist organization to its constituent members, the Report contains a record of the year's achievements, an important item of which is a series of Regional Conferences held in different districts of England. There were 11 of these in the summer of 1931 alone, conferences attended by 2,600 delegates representing upward of 640 local authorities in England and Wales. Each one of these Conferences was directed to a very definite objective and discussions were had of the live current housing problems as they exist in England to-day, with emphasis upon the workings of the Housing Laws and the changes proposed in them, also brief reports with reference to the International Congress at Berlin and the great Building Exhibition in connection with it, the Conference on Transport and Regional Planning, the London Housing Exhibition and other happenings during the year. The Report records in passing the death of two distinguished housing reformers, T. C. Horsfall, a pioneer in housing work in England in the 90s' and Major Lovelock,

active since the war, and well known to American housing and town planning workers.

There are interesting comments with regard to the various measures that were before Parliament during the period under review, including the Report of the Committee on Rent Restrictions, the new Rural Housing Act, the Act for the Preservation of London's Squares*, the Report of the Departmental Committee on Regional Development and the Housing Law of 1924.

In addition to this review of the work and happenings of the year, the Report contains a number of Papers on important aspects of the housing question as it occupies the attention of housing workers and town planners in England today. Among these may be mentioned the following:

The Town and Country Planning Bill; Housing by Public Utility Societies; The Movement in Wales; The Movement in Scotland; Rent Rebates under the Housing Act by H. Lloyd Parry; Housing Achievements of the City of Newcastle-upon-Tyne by R. G. Roberts; The Present Position in regard to Town and Regional Planning in England and Wales by A. R. Potter; The Importance of a Statutory Regional Plan for Greater London by Dr. Raymond Unwin; Dr. Raymond Unwin, President of the Royal Institute of British Architects; The Present Position of London's Slum Problem by Irene T. Barclay; Town Planning in Relation to Suburban Railways by Frank Pick; Housing the Tuberculous—An Experiment at Middlesbrough by Preston Kitchen; and London's Underground Dwellings by Colonel H. J. Barton.

We commend to the careful study of every person interested in housing reform in the United States this encouraging record of a year's activity by this important and successful housing organization in England of which the President is William H. Gaunt, O. B. E., and the executive Officer, John G. Martin, to whom application should be made for copies of the Report at 41 Russell Square, London, W. C. 1, England.

BEAUTIFYING SCOTLAND

ARTISTIC AND WELL DESIGNED COTTAGES

If the suggestions of the Council of the Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland are followed by the local authorities and by private enterprise throughout Scotland, there will in time be a new Scotland, and in place of the dour architecture which has characterized that country so much in the past we may expect to see before long charming cottages dotting the countryside, which instead of detracting from its natural beauty will add to it.

This Council after giving consideration to the matter for a considerable time recently decided to aid in securing the erection of houses

* See page 155.

of pleasing design that would fit in with the general surroundings in which they were built, and to that end caused to be prepared a series of Model Cottage Designs. A committee of architects, members of the Association, were asked to prepare working drawings of houses suitable for use in the rural districts. As most of the smaller types of houses provided in these districts are being erected under one or other of the State-assisted housing schemes, it was decided that the houses should conform to the requirements of the statutes and of the Department of Health for Scotland in order that the Government grant might be available.

The Council's purpose in preparing these model designs was to meet the needs of local authorities in rural districts who may have decided for reasons satisfactory to them not to employ a fully qualified and competent architect, but to have the work carried out by their own officials. It is expected also that these plans will be of considerable benefit to private individuals who may be contemplating the erection of cottages in rural districts and who similarly may be unable to engage the services of an architect.

Plans have been prepared for 6 different types of houses. It is expected by the Association that these houses will not cost more than the cost which can be approved by local authorities and by the Department of Health for Scotland for purposes of the subsidy. It is proposed to supply the plans to the local authorities at a nominal price—£2 per house up to 12 houses in number on one site, and over this number £1 per house. This price includes 3 sets of plans of each type of house.

From the designs that we have seen, it is quite evident that a real service is being rendered to Scotland by this work comparable to the service which Raymond Unwin rendered the Ministry of Health and England under the Addison régime when he prepared his famous "Manual"* of Model Types of Cottages for that country.

To Americans and to American architects particularly this is a most interesting harking back to the practices of Colonial days in that country when all of the most beautiful Colonial residences—which we have come to prize so to-day—were built not under an architect's direction but from so-called "vignettes" or books of plates possessed by the builders of that time who were, if not artists, at least artisans of a very high order.

It is to be hoped that the local authorities in Scotland will realize the great value of the service which the Association for the Preservation of Rural Scotland has rendered to their country and will avail themselves of these attractive designs.

* See "*Housing*", *September, 1919*.